DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 127 043 PS 008 793

TITLE Child and Family Services Act, 1975. Joint Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Children and Youth and the Subcommittee on Employment, Poverty, and Migratory Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate, and the Subcommittee on Select Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, Ninety-Fourth Congress, First Session. Part 3.

INSTITUTION Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.; Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PUB DATE 12 Mar 75

NOTE 139p.; Pages 476-481 and 565-572 are copyrighted and therefore not available. They are not included in the pagination; Not available in hard copy due to print size of original; For related documents, see PS 008 790-799

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.

DESCRIPTORS *Child Care; Child Care Centers; Child Welfare; *Day Care Services; *Early Childhood Education; Educational Legislation; Family Day Care; *Family Programs; *Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; Health Services; Infants; Medical Services; Migrant Welfare Services; Minority Groups; Nutrition; Parents; Preschool Children; Social Services; Standards; State Federal Aid

IDENTIFIERS *Child and Family Services Act; Legislative Hearings

ABSTRACT

This document records proceedings of the joint hearings on the Child and Family Services Act, 1975 (bills S.626 and H.R.2966). Included are witnesses' testimony of March 12, 1975, statements presented, and additional information (including related publications, communications, and questions and answers). (SB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES ACT, 1975

ED127043

JOINT HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH

AND THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT, POVERTY, AND MIGRATORY LABOR

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE UNITED STATES SENATE

AND THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT EDUCATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-FOURTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

S. 626 and H.R. 2966

TO PROVIDE FOR SERVICES TO CHILDREN AND THEIR FAMILIES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

PART 3

MARCH 12, 1975

PS 008793

Printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the House Committee on Education and Labor

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1976

57-640 O

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr., New Jersey, *Chairman*

JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia
CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
GAYLORD NELSON, Wisconsin
WALTER F. MONDALE, Minnesota
THOMAS F. EAGLETON, Missouri
ALAN CRANSTON, California
WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, Maine

JACOB K. JAVITS, New York
RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Pennsylvania
ROBERT TAFT, Jr., Ohio
J. GLENN BEALL, Jr., Maryland
ROBERT T. STAFFORD, Vermont
PAUL LAXALT, Nevada

DONALD ELISBURG, *General Counsel*
MARJORIE M. WHITTAKER, *Chief Clerk*
JAY B. CUTLER, *Minority Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH

WALTER F. MONDALE, Minnesota, *Chairman*

HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr., New Jersey
JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
GAYLORD NELSON, Wisconsin
ALAN CRANSTON, California

ROBERT T. STAFFORD, Vermont
ROBERT TAFT, Jr., Ohio
J. GLENN BEALL, Jr., Maryland
PAUL LAXALT, Nevada

A. SIDNEY JOHNSON III, *Professional Staff Member*
LARRY GREENBERG, *Minority Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT, POVERTY, AND MIGRATORY LABOR

GAYLORD NELSON, Wisconsin, *Chairman*

EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
WALTER F. MONDALE, Minnesota
ALAN CRANSTON, California
JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia
WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, Maine
HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr., New Jersey
THOMAS F. EAGLETON, Missouri

ROBERT TAFT, Jr., Ohio
JACOB K. JAVITS, New York
RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Pennsylvania
J. GLENN BEALL, Jr., Maryland
PAUL LAXALT, Nevada

RICHARD E. JOHNSON, *Counsel*
LARRY GREENBERG, *Minority Counsel*

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., New Jersey
JOHN H. DENT, Pennsylvania
DOMINICK V. DANIELS, New Jersey
JOHN BRADEMAS, Indiana
JAMES G. O'HARA, Michigan
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii (on leave)
LLOYD MEEDS, Washington
PHILLIP BURTON, California
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM "BILL" CLAY, Missouri
SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, New York
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina
WILLIAM LEHMAN, Florida
JAIME BENITEZ, Puerto Rico
MICHAEL BLOUIN, Iowa
ROBERT CORNELL, Wisconsin
TED RISENHOOVER, Oklahoma
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
EDWARD BEARD, Rhode Island
LEO ZEFERETTI, New York
GEORGE MILLER, California
RONALD MOTTL, Ohio
TIM HALL, Illinois

ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota
JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Ohio
ALPHONZO BELL, California
JOHN N. ERLENBORN, Illinois
MARVIN L. ESCH, Michigan
EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN, Pennsylvania
PETER A. PEYSER, New York
RONALD A. SARASIN, Connecticut
JOHN BUCHANAN, Alabama
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
LARRY PRESSLER, South Dakota
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
VIRGINIA SMITH, Nebraska

DONALD M. BAKER, *Chief Clerk and Associate Counsel*
ROBERT C. ANDRINGA, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT EDUCATION

JOHN BRADEMAS, Indiana, *Chairman*

PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii (on leave)
LLOYD MEEDS, Washington
SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, New York
WILLIAM LEHMAN, Florida
ROBERT CORNELL, Wisconsin
EDWARD BEARD, Rhode Island
LEO ZEFERETTI, New York
GEORGE MILLER, California
TIM HALL, Illinois
CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Ex Officio*

ALPHONZO BELL, California
PETER A. PEYSER, New York
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
LARRY PRESSLER, South Dakota
ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota, *Ex Officio*

JACK G. DUNCAN, *Counsel*

NOTE: Copyrighted materials included in the original copy of this document are not available for ERIC reproduction at this time. The following articles have been deleted from this document:

p. 476-481 "The Psychology of Day Care." Susan Edmiston. Copyright 1971 by the N Y M Corp.

p. 565-572 "Day Care: Who Needs It?" Copyright 1973 League of Women Voters Education Fund.

CONTENTS

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF WITNESSES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 12, 1975

Page

Hertzberg, Edwina L., executive director, Greater Minneapolis Day Care Association, acompanied by Ann Ellwood, project director, Minnesota Early Learning Design, and Tutti Sherlock, executive director, Olmstead County Council for Coordinated Child Care, Rochester, Minn., a panel 445

Colom, Audrey, vice chairwoman, National Women's Political Caucus, accompanied by Mary Grace Plaskett, national chairperson of Task Force on Child Care, National Organization for Women; Carol Burris, president, Women's Lobby, Inc.; Arvonne V. Fraser, legislative chairperson and past president, Women's Equality Action League; Sandy Hill, national vice president, Federally Employed Women; and Julie Kisielewski, a panel 470

Gray, Dr. Susan W., Peabody College, Nashville, Tenn., accompanied by Dr. James J. Gallagher, director, Porter Graham Child Development Center, University of North Carolina, and Ms. Earline Kendall, Nashville, Tenn., a panel 509

STATEMENTS

Colom, Audrey, vice chairwoman, National Women's Political Caucus, accompanied by Mary Grace Plaskett, national chairperson of Task Force on Child Care, National Organization for Women; Carol Burris, president, Women's Lobby, Inc.; Arvonne V. Fraser, legislative chairperson and past president, Women's Equity Action League; Sandy Hill, national vice president, Federally Employed Women; and Julie Kisielewski, a panel 470

Federally Employed Women, Inc., prepared statement 504

Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, James J. Gallagher, director, prepared statement 519

Gray, Dr. Susan W., Peabody College, Nashville, Tenn., accompanied by Dr. James J. Gallagher, director, Porter Graham Child Development Center, University of North Carolina, and Ms. Earline Kendall, Nashville, Tenn., a panel 509

Prepared statement 511

Hertzberg, Edwina L., executive director, Greater Minneapolis Day Care Association, accompanied by Ann Ellwood, project director, Minnesota Early Learning Design, and Tutti Sherlock, executive director, Olmstead County Council for Coordinated Child Care, Rochester, Minn., a panel 445

Kendall, Earline, professional day care teacher, Nashville, Tenn., prepared statement 530

Keys, Hon. Martha, a U.S. Representative in Congress from the State of Kansas, prepared statement 547

League of Women Voters of the United States, prepared statement 561

Matsunaga, Hon. Spark M., a U.S. Representative in Congress from the State of Hawaii, prepared statement 544

Mink, Hon. Patsy T., a U.S. Representative in Congress from the State of Hawaii, prepared statement 541

Minnesota Early Learning Design, Ann Ellwood, executive director, prepared statement 460

National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., prepared statement ..... Page 493
Women's Equity Action League (WEAL), Arvonne S. Fraser, legislative chairperson and former president, prepared statement 499
Women's Lobby, Inc., Carol Burris, president, prepared statement 485

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Articles, publications, etc.:
Day Care—Who Needs It?, from the League of Women Voters Education Fund 565
OSA–74–048, Dan Manning, president, Oshkosh Student Association 591
Psychology of Day Care, by Susan Edmiston, KNOW, Inc., Pittsburgh, Pa 476
Some Statistics on Women in the Labor Force 472
Communications to:
Brademas, Hon. John, a U.S. Representative in Congress from the State of Indiana from:
Employees of the National Bureau of Economic Research, New York, N.Y. 589
Hyde, Hon. Henry J., a Representative in Congress from the State of Illinois, March 27, 1975 586
Miller, Susan (Mrs. Herbert), State chairwoman, public affairs, National Council of Jewish Women, Southfield, Mich., April 3, 1975 583
National Child Day Care Association, Parent Policy Committee, Washington, D.C., March 1975 575
Perkins, Minor W., president, Educare Child Care Centers, Inc., Memphis, Tenn., March 24, 1975 581
Rostenkowski, Dan, a Representative in Congress from the State of Illinois, March 26, 1975 584
Schroeder, Hon. Patricia, a Representative in Congress from the State of Colorado, February 28, 1975 573
Townsend, Mamie L., administrator, Auntie Mame's Child Development Center, Inc., Indianapolis, Ind., March 27, 1975 (with enclosure) 587
Duncan, Jack, counsel, Subcommittee on Select Education, from:
Helms, Judith S., executive director, National Council of Organizations for Children and Youth, Washington, D.C., March 11, 1975 560
Hertzberg, Edwina L., executive director, Greater Minneapolis Day Care Association, Minneapolis, Minn., March 18, 1975 464
James, Sara Lyon, Ph. D., executive director, National Association of School Psychologists, Washington, D.C. 550
Koff, Robert H., dean, Roosevelt University, Chicago, Ill., March 7, 1975 577
Reese, Msgr. Thomas J., ACSW, executive director, Catholic Social Services, Inc., Wilmington, Del., April 14, 1975 (with enclosure) 555
Mondale, Hon. Walter F., a U.S. Senator from the State of Minnesota, from Mary Afgan, Eneb'put Children's Center, Fairbanks, Alaska, February 21, 1975 549
Perkins, Hon. Carl D., a Representative in Congress from the State of Kentucky, from Lindy (Mrs. Hale) Boggs, a Representative in Congress from the State of Louisiana, March 21, 1975 579
Schroeder, Hon. Patricia, a Representative in Congress from the State of Colorado, from Susan L. Slack, director, Jack & Jill Child Development Center, Fort Collins, Colo., January 31, 1975 574
Questions and answers:
Response to questions of Congressman Alphonzo Bell, relating to the Child and Family Services Act, prepared by Edwina L. Hertzberg, executive director of the Greater Minneapolis Day Care Association 465

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES, ACT, 1975

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 12, 1975

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH AND THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT, POVERTY,
AND MIGRATORY LABOR OF THE
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE;
AND THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT EDUCATION,
OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittees met, pursuant to notice, at 9:35 a.m., in room 4232, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Senator Walter F. Mondale (subcommittee chairman), presiding.

Present: Senator Mondale, Representatives Bell, Jeffords, and Pressler.

Senator MONDALE. The committee will come to order.

This morning we continue our hearings on the proposed legislation on child and family services.

Our first panel will be from the State of Minnesota, Ms. Edwina Hertzberg, Ms. Ann Ellwood, and Ms. Tutti Sherlock.

If you will please come to the witness table.

We are delighted to have you with us this morning.

STATEMENT OF EDWINA L. HERTZBERG, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, GREATER MINNEAPOLIS DAY CARE ASSOCIATION, ACCOMPANIED BY ANN ELLWOOD, PROJECT DIRECTOR, MINNESOTA EARLY LEARNING DESIGN, AND TUTTI SHERLOCK, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, OLMSTEAD COUNTY COUNCIL FOR COORDINATED CHILD CARE, ROCHESTER, MINN., A PANEL

Ms. HERTZBERG. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to present testimony on the Child and Family Services Act.

My name is Edwina L. Hertzberg. I am executive director of Greater Minneapolis Day Care Association, a private nonprofit coordinating agency for day care services in Hennepin County, Minn.

The coordinated approach to services:

For more than 4 years, Greater Minneapolis Day Care Association has worked with parents and others in Hennepin County to plan, develop, and coordinate comprehensive day care services in our community. Agencies and institutions have been encouraged to share resources—health, nutrition, training—to provide quality, comprehensive programs for children. Volunteer hours have been countless.

We are fortunate to live in a community of enlightened organizations willing to extend their resources to the maximum in the interests of children and families.

The experiences of the Greater Minneapolis Day Care Association and other similar coordinating groups have demonstrated the effectiveness of the coordinated approach.

Further, Greater Minneapolis Day Care Association, with the support of other organizations dedicated to children, has successfully encouraged local governmental bodies to increase their financial commitment to children's service. Through the Minnesota Children's Lobby, we have encouraged our State legislature to increase its share for children.

But this cooperation, these efforts, have barely scratched needs of primarily the most economically deprived families in our community. There simply are not enough resources available on the local level to provide the services needed by the families and children of our community.

Further, at the present time, every agency and institution with whom we work to provide comprehensive services is under tremendous economic pressure and, at a time when pressures on families are increasing, the same pressures of inflation and recession may force service cutbacks.

Federal leadership and commitment, in partnership with the local level, is essential if the needs of children and families in Hennepin are to be met.

Hennepin County has a population of approximately 1 million people, about one-quarter of Minnesota's population, half of which is within the city limits of Minneapolis.

The twin cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul form the largest base in the State. And although Hennepin County contains some rural areas, its concerns are those of any urban complex. Two-thirds of Minnesota's children living below the poverty line are in the Twin City area. More than 60 percent of these families are headed by women.

Minnesota's statistics reflect the national. One out of three mothers with children under 6 works outside the home. Their 130,907 children are served by 19,056 licensed slots of full day care—14.5 percent of the need.

The scene is repeated is Hennepin County—32,143 children under 6 whose mothers or single male heads of household works, 6,000 slots of licensed care available in day care centers and family day care homes. The remaining children are somewhere, in unlicensed care.

We estimate that 7 percent of our children care for themselves. Another 6,351 children are in a half-day nursery school programs, including 225 enrolled in Head Start programs in Hennepin County.

Department of Labor statistics indicate that as the birth rate drops, the demand for child care is increasing. The growing divorce rate also contributes to the rising demand for service.

Comprehensive health, dental, nutrition services are available only to the approximately 1,400 children served in programs funded through title IV–A in Hennepin County.

This really is barely scratching the surface. And because Minnesota has reached its ceiling in social service funds, despite lengthen-

ing waiting lists, there are no additional funds to expand these services. Title XX's reasonable eligibility levels will have no effect without additional funding.

NEEDS OF THE NEAR POOR

For families just above the poverty line, the near poor, services are simply not available. Too "rich" to receive free services, too poor to afford quality services, they really are trapped for they have no choices—too poor to stay home, too poor to afford child care.

Consider the effect of this trap on their children. Let me share with you a discussion I had with an irate, incredulous parent last week.

She had received a needed salary increase and had elevated herself out of her child's day care program. She was no longer eligible for free care, there was no sliding fee scale, and she could not afford the $25 per week fee. She was frustrated, angry, in tears. Reward had become punishment. Consider the effect on her child. This is repeated daily.

NEEDS CUT ACROSS SOCIOECONOMIC LINES

But the developmental needs of children and families are diverse, crossing socioeconomic lines. We all recognize the importance of the early years. They are equally important for all children. We recognize that the family is the primary nurturing factor in the development of a child—again for all children.

What we do in concert with families to support and encourage the strength of the family system will, I believe, make a difference in how our children develop in the future.

And what are we doing? Aside from medicaid and private physician care, there is no system of regular health checkups and screening. There is no estimate of the number of children who enter school with undetected, untreated disabilities, handicapping learning. How much better it would be to detect early; better still, to prevent.

Sixteen percent of Greater Minneapolis Day Care Association's calls per week from parents seeking care are for infant care. There are 140 slots of infant toddler center care in Hennepin County, 4 percent of existing services.

We know that 53 percent of the mothers of school-aged children work. In Hennepin County, that is 54,560 women. There are 200 slots of after school care.

Twenty-four-hour care is virtually nonexistent in our community. We surmise that the children of single parents working a swing shift are home alone. Intact families often work split shifts to accommodate child care needs—effective in the short run but not conducive to strengthening parental relationships.

"Drop in" care is available on a limited basis some family day care homes and centers. It should be well recognized for its important use and potential—that of providing a change in environment for parent and child which refreshes and renews. This, as well as other models, should rightfully be considered as important ingredients in child-abuse prevention. At the present time, drop in care is available on a fee basis only.

Sick care, successfully demonstrated, and much in demand, is presently nonexistent. It has fallen victim to lack of funds. And so employed parents often have no alternative but to lose a day's pay or send the child off to center or a family day care mother, sick.

In federally funded programs, 11 percent are classified as "special needs" children, referred for social, psychological or medical reasons. Again, scratching the surface.

What happens to other children with similar needs? What long-lasting effect will nontreatment have? Often, after a few weeks in a good child development program, a positive effect on the child is obvious.

The Minneapolis Public Health Department estimates that the mothers of 7 percent of children born each year in Hennepin County have received care, if any, only in the last trimester of pregnancy.

Prenatal training exists in our community, but it is limited. Society seems to continue believing that biological birth a parent makes. I suspect those of us who are parents really do know better.

The need for public education on the developmental needs of children cannot be overemphasized. It is a need felt by organizations across the board in Minnesota. The very fact that here, in 1975, in the richest country in the world, we are discussing these unmet birth, nutrition, and developmental needs of children bears witness to the need for raising public awareness.

The authors of the proposed legislation are to be congratulated on their tenacity and determination to find ways to meet the needs of children and families in our country, and in concert with the family.

It seems to me that any approach other than in the context of the family system would be unrealistic and fragmented.

We believe parent participation essential to the relevance of programs addressing children. Parent participation takes many forms and requires continual encouragement and support, but the results for children and families is well worth the effort.

Need for quality, developmental efforts: Programs for young children can and should take as many forms as there are programs, all within the context of focus on the developmental needs of children.

Custodial care—mind-numbing mediocrity—must not be accepted if we are really concerned for children. Again, national leadership is essential. Federal standards which address the developmental needs of children must be maintained and assured implementation.

And what about training? Personnel should be considered trained along standards of good child development and within the context of the philosophy of particular programs.

In summary, the needs for supportive services to children and families is great. It cuts across age groups and socioeconomic lines. Existing social service dollars have barely scratched the surface.

The needs of our children and families must be addressed comprehensively, prenatally through childhood, unless we are willing to settle for fragmentated services, at best, shadows of how it ought to be, reaction, not action, continued unmet needs.

How we, as a country, how we, as parents and decisionmakers, act to meet these needs in concert with other parents will determine to a great extent the future of our country.

Thank you, gentlemen. It is a privilege to participate in your hearings.

Have you any questions?

Senator MONDALE. Thank you for an excellent statement.

How many full-time day care slots are there in Hennepin County now?

Ms. HERTZBERG. Six thousand, including family day care homes.

Senator MONDALE. How many of those are affiliated with your organization?

Ms. HERTZBERG. I would say approximately 1,500 directly. All are affiliated insofar as information and referral.

Senator MONDALE. Of the 6,000, how many are home care?

Ms. HERTZBERG. Twenty-seven hundred.

Senator MONDALE. And the others are——

Ms. HERTZBERG. In center care.

Senator MONDALE. How many of the center care slots, in your opinion, meet the minimum day care standards of the legislation?

Ms. HERTZBERG. Of your legislation?

Senator MONDALE. Of the interagency day care standards——

Ms. HERTZBERG. I would say approximately 1,100 as an estimate.

Senator MONDALE. Does that include developmental health?

Ms. HERTZBERG. Yes.

Senator MONDALE. What do you estimate the annual cost of day care per child full-time with decent developmental care——

Ms. HERTZBERG. Meeting Federal interagency standards, approximately $2,336 per year, approximately, as of last year. Maybe a little higher this year.

Senator MONDALE. How many full-time day care slots are needed in Hennepin County?

Ms. HERTZBERG. Thirty-two thousand.

If we are to meet the needs, the existing needs, that is people presently employed, not in work or training, that is children under 6 whose parents work at the present time.

Senator MONDALE. Thirty-two thousand now?

Ms. HERTZBERG. Yes, now.

Senator MONDALE. Some of that would be home care and center care once again?

Ms. HERTZBERG. Yes.

Senator MONDALE. What is your annual budget approximately?

Ms. HERTZBERG. In Hennepin County?

Senator MONDALE. Yes.

Ms. HERTZBERG. We have approximately $2.6 million in federally supported child care.

Senator MONDALE. Is that mostly title IV money, social services?

Ms. HERTZBERG. Yes, it is 1.8 in title IV moneys.

Senator MONDALE. What other money do you get?

Ms. HERTZBERG. We get State money. Parents fees make up the bulk of child care.

Senator MONDALE. How much State care do you get?

Ms. HERTZBERG. $106,000 per year.

Senator MONDALE. And the rest you pick up by fees?

Ms. HERTZBERG. The rest by fees. We have $300,000 from Hennepin County, $364,000 in model cities funds, and expect to double that with community development.

Senator MONDALE. Do you expect to get more model cities money?

Ms. HERTZBERG. With community development we expect $700,000.

Senator MONDALE. Now, are any of these day care center facilities in schools?

Ms. HERTZBERG. Some are in school space, yes. Approximately six utilize space and/or services from the school. By that, I mean social services, equipment, et cetera.

Senator MONDALE. Some argue that this program ought to go entirely through the schools. Some argue that none of it should go through the schools.

What do you think?

Ms. HERTZBERG. It seems to me that, first, there must be alternative choices for parents. I think that has to be the most important consideration, what parents want.

Second, it seems to me most important that parents control the programs. It does not seem important to me where the program is housed as long as parents have the decisionmaking power within the program itself.

We have had good relationships and good experiences with schools in Minneapolis and in the suburban areas, but it has been a parent-controlled program.

Senator MONDALE. How do the parents assert their control under your program?

Do they have a board?

Ms. HERTZBERG. Yes.

Senator MONDALE. An overall board, and a board at each center; is that it; or what?

Ms. HERTZBERG. Yes.

The boards are at each center. We have a parent dominated board, Greater Minneapolis Day Care Association, but each of the programs is autonomous.

Two programs are being run by the school. Those do not have as much parent involvement as the others.

Senator MONDALE. How big a backlog do you have of applicants for full-time day care?

Ms. HERTZBERG. Model cities program alone, which serves 365 children, has a waiting list of 400.

Senator MONDALE. 400?

Ms. HERTZBERG. 400.

The Model Cities program alone: Each other center keeps its own waiting list. Our calls number approximately 60 a week, and they have increased. There have been no decrease in this economic situation, rather an increase.

Senator MONDALE. You testified about parents reaching a certain income limit and finding themselves over the ceiling of eligibility for day care.

Now, how did that come about?

In the new social services program, we have this sliding scale so we try to avoid that.

Will that make a difference?

Ms. HERTZBERG. It would make a difference in Minnesota if we had more social service funds, because we have reached our ceiling in

Minnesota and we have reached our ceiling in Hennepin County. There will be no additional funds through title IV–A or title XX, as it is to be.

Senator MONDALE. Even as amended?

Ms. HERTZBERG. No.

Senator MONDALE. So you will still have to keep this arbitrary cut-off?

Ms. HERTZBERG. Yes; that is my understanding.

Senator MONDALE. In other words, you are in a position where it would be nice to do it, but in order to have the sliding scale, you would have to kick some people out of the program?

Ms. HERTZBERG. Absolutely.

Senator MONDALE. It seems to me to be very destructive of our system of incentives in this country to say that you made somewhat a success out of yourself and the reward is that your kids are now out of day care.

Ms. HERTZBERG. Very much a disincentive to work. It is very depressing to families.

In reality, with families at the present time, a family of four, say they are making $6,000 a year, obviously they cannot survive. They have to have more income.

If the mother seeks a job, she has no free child care because she would be making over the income eligibility.

There is no service available to them because they cannot afford the cost of child care no matter how minimal.

Senator MONDALE. Now, we probably will amend the tax laws shortly to increase the minimum exemption by maybe $800 or $900 a person and increase the standard deduction, adding maybe $300 or $400 to the money that they can keep. We are talking about spending to families which work and which earn something, say $5,000 or less, a check constituting 10 percent of their income, on the theory that the payroll tax takes up that much.

But since they are working, and if they have got a sharp pencil, it will be just as smart to stop working and go on welfare. If nothing else, to show our appreciation and create incentive to work, we will, in effect—I guess we call it low-income workers tax bonus, or something like that.

Will that tax relief help them to better pay for some of these fees?

Ms. HERTZBERG. I am certain it would. Anything is going to help.

The tax relief, insofar as tax deduction for child care, really does not help low-income families very much, but I think cash in hand would certainly help.

Senator MONDALE. There is an $18,000 ceiling for people you are serving by and large, and their income taxes are not high enough so that gives them much relief.

Ms. HERTZBERG. No.

The reality is you have to have cash in hand to pay for services, first of all. You just do not have that much cash in hand to do it.

Senator MONDALE. OK. Thank you.

Ms. Ellwood.

Ms. ELLWOOD. My name is Ann Ellwood. I am executive director of the Minnesota Early Learning Design in Minneapolis.

I would like to summarize my prepared statement.

As Director of Minnesota Early Learning Design, my perspective on the Child and Family Services Act is somewhat different from those who are concerned with services to children.

My interest is in how this bill can provide services to parents that will result in better conditions for children.

I have studied this legislation from this perspective and I am convinced that it has the necessary flexibility to support innovative programs of the type I am about to describe.

For the past one and a half years, I have been involved in identifying and evaluating various ways to provide support services to families. In the course of this investigation, I have visited programs for parents and children across the country. I have talked to leaders in the many disciplines that are concerned about families and children. And I am grateful to you and the staff for cooperation and introductions on my behalf.

Equally important, I have talked with parents about their needs and concerns.

As I have talked to people, read literature and visited programs, I have been struck by two concerns.

First, there really is, across this country, a renewed and growing consciousness of the profound effect that parents have on the lives of their children. The role of the family and its long-term impact on the child is receiving greater public attention.

I am convinced that you, Senator, have played a vital role in this awareness.

I find concern is reflected in all quarters, from the ghetto to the ivory tower. And yet most people agree that parents do a remarkable job in the face of the disruptions caused by changing patterns of living, mobility, economic problems, isolation, and lack of training for the task.

But, coupled with the renewed recognition that families are vital to the society, is the acknowledgement that we need to offer services to assist parents in their child-rearing responsibilities.

But people are groping. People are searching for ways to support families and to answer questions like, "What makes a happy child?" What is a "good parent"?

After a year of intensive information collection, Minnesota Early Learning Design feels that the vast majority of parent education programs are too short, too expensive, and too late.

So we have developed one approach to the problem.

MELD intends to use experienced parents to teach and support new parents, beginning before the birth of the first child, and continuing to about the age of 2.

Our idea builds on a wave of self-help programs operating across the country which have been highly successful in dealing with difficult human problems that have often defied traditional professional therapy.

Programs such as Alcoholics Anonymous and Synanon, have operated effectively for decades. Parents Anonymous, as you know, is a newer program established to combat child abuse.

More recently, this peer self-help approach has been used to address human problems that society does not define so harshly.

Weight Watchers, Parents Without Partners, groups for very short people, groups for very tall people, and groups for people who have common physical problems, represent a few of the array of support groups that are very useful to people in providing needed information and psychological support.

We feel that the basic idea—whereby someone who has been through a troubling experience can help others who are going through it—builds on a natural, appealing, and inexpensive concept of parents helping parents. Moreover, the peer approach seems to be a good way to develop the self-esteem and self-confidence that are absolutely critical to the task of parenting.

My prepared remarks describe in much greater detail the peer self approach and our proposed methodology.

I endorse these bills because the Child and Family Services Act addresses the problem of support to families in their child rearing. It offers flexibility to accommodate innovations, new program ideas such as ours.

Equally significant is the freedom the bill provides to parents to choose from available program options, protecting their authority over the care of their children, and helping them to shoulder their responsibilities while maintaining control over their children's preschool years.

Senator MONDALE. How did you arrive at this, what I gather to be, somewhat different conclusion than you started out with?

I understand you have been working on a foundation grant for over a year, studying what children need in this community, and you may have started out somewhat with an institutional strategy in mind, but you have ended up with a recommendation that we draw on the experience of parents, helping parents, in effect, meeting parents, reinforcing each other, meeting periodically to just talk about problems and helping each other in that vein.

How did you come to that conclusion?

Is it because of what parents said they wanted?

Ms. ELLWOOD. Yes, parents as well as researchers and service professionals. As you know, much of the early childhood research is stressing that the most critical years are from birth—or before—to the age of 2 or 3. Many feel that developmental delays that are not met by the age of 3 are far more difficult to turn around. Child care and youth workers are saying, "We see these kids too late. We must prevent these problems from ever occurring." And yet, services for children are rare before the age of 2½. This time is the time that most parents are coping alone and too often, in isolation.

Senator MONDALE. Suppose someone said the way to do this is to have centers where you take the children as infants and provide institutional care for them outside the home? That is not what you are saying. You say—you may not be rejecting that—but you are saying an alternative should be to work with the parents by getting them together in groups, talking about problems of parenthood and so on.

How did you arrive at that?

Ms. ELLWOOD. As awareness grows about the impact that parents have on the lives of their children during the earliest years of life, there ought to be a period of examination of different models. MELD is one model. We sought to expand the natural helping relationships that occur naturally between experienced parents and novices in the best of conditions. We looked for a less expensive model too, and this required a deprofessionalized program—that is, professionals serve in supervisory and backup capacities. The peer volunteer parents provide the service.

Senator MONDALE. Did the parents indicate some desire for this kind of thing?

Ms. ELLWOOD. Yes indeed. Our Parent Advisory Committee labored long and diligently and were a significant resource to us throughout our research and development period.

Senator MONDALE. Did they indicate that they feel inadequate, that they think they need help, they would like to check ideas out with other parents?

Ms. ELLWOOD. Exactly.

The cab driver, yesterday, talked about a support group. He is recently divorced. He said, "Two months ago I would never be able to say to myself, 'Jim Smith, you are OK.' Now, I can say that. The pain is going away, and I think Parents Without Partners has made the difference."

New parents are often afraid and anxious. Many are isolated from the support of the extended family.

But I do not want to leave the impression that all we are doing is sharing problems. We are also giving new parents specific information, and skills.

Senator MONDALE. What sort of things would you discuss at these meetings?

Ms. ELLWOOD. Our curriculum is divided into four parts, based on the age of the child. During phase 1 when the woman is pregnant, discussions will include fetal growth and development, physical and emotional health care for the mother, labor and delivery, planning for the changes that will soon occur; and in addition, there would be discussions of fears, concerns, values, and feelings about parenthood.

What are the needs of the poor at this time?

What are the health care needs that are specific at this point in time?

Senator MONDALE. Suppose a family came and said, "We need food stamps. We do not know how to get them."

Would you try to provide suggestions and advice as to whether they need housing, food stamps, and so on?

Ms. ELLWOOD. In addition to parent group leaders, we are going to have another kind of volunteer called the community resource assistant. That person's responsibility will be to serve as a resource for the parent groups, whether it be helping them form babysitting co-ops; getting through the welfare maze and be an advocate; or helping parents tap community resources they need.

Senator MONDALE. I sat in on a Parents Anonymous meeting in Denver one day, and one of the things they do at each meeting is they ask for something. They would say we would like to have some help on credit problems. At the next meeting, they would bring somebody in who can help them figure out what to do with all these creditors that were calling all the time, like pulling the phone out.

Ms. ELLWOOD. I think people help one another in problem solving.

Senator MONDALE. Those families often, just like Alcoholics Anonymous, would call each other, or they would babysit——

Ms. ELLWOOD. We hope to have a basic curriculum core and then a lot of flexibility so that the parents' groups can follow special, more narrow interests, if they choose.

Senator MONDALE. We had in our family hearings an expert who pointed out that in 1900 over 50 percent of the families in Boston were three-generation. In other words, there was probably an aunt, grandfather, or someone in the house, presumably at the time the new family was being born. And now only 4 percent of them are that way.

I wonder if that does not enter into it?

There is a tremendous mobility now. We used to provide experience for new parents was with members of the family to help out, to be babysitters, to provide a lifetime of experience and training for new parents.

Now, that is largely gone, is it not?

Ms. ELLWOOD. I agree.

And the natural modeling that occurs is not available to most people.

Senator MONDALE. Thank you very much.

Ms. Sherlock.

Ms. SHERLOCK. Senator Mondale, I appreciate the opportunity to appear and testify before this joint Senate and House committee on the S. 626 and H.R. 2966 Child and Family Services Act of 1975.

Every social ill of our times arises from behavior. Reasonable as it may seem to work toward the cure of such ills, we shall not succeed until we learn how to prevent them.

My concern begins with the behavior of the child who becomes the man. No person will disagree when I state categorically that children are our greatest natural resources, yet the world behaves as though they were no resource at all.

The land, the water, the air and, most important, the oil, all are to be conserved for they support life. What, after all, does a child contribute?

How shortsighted we are. The child conceived today is the adolescent of tomorrow and the adult of the day after. Nothing is more important than the person that child becomes. He alone holds the key to the future.

Yet, knowing all this and knowing, too, how important those first few years of life can be, we have constructed a society that puts great demands and pressures on families—they must succeed and produce financially; they must make social and community commitments; and if there is any time or energy left over, they must raise their children with limited support from the community to assist them in this ultimate responsibility.

We need only to look again at the pressures put on families for simple survival to examine the voids of support services—child care, health and nutrition resources—to know how little support the community gives its families.

57-649 O - 76 - pt. 3 - 2

Examine first the need for such a simple resource as care for children while their parents join the labor force in order to put food on the table.

In nonurban Minnesota's Polk County, 767 families with children under the age of 6 needing child care, there are zero number of licensed day care slots—either family or group.

Lake County, 205 families needing child, care, has 1 licensed slot.

Clay County, 1,121 families in need of child care, has 103 licensed slots.

Morrison County, 601 families in need of child care, has 16 licensed slots.

And it goes on and on.

Senator MONDALE. Lake County has one?

Ms. SHERLOCK. One slot.

Senator MONDALE. What would you do with one slot?

Ms. SHERLOCK. Well, it makes their records look good.

Across our State we begin to see efforts made to develop child care resources and support services for families, but they are like patches on a worn shirt. We see the number of licensed day care slots increase during a 4-year timespan, 1970–74, from 0 to 8; 5 to 14; 105 to 165; and in my own county, Olmsted, 475 to 683. But that still leaves nearly 2,000 children, below the age of 6, being cared for in possible unsuitable environments.

Title IV–A of the Social Security Act has been another patch on our worn shirt. Parents who fall under the past, present, or potential AFDC category are eligible for child care services free of charge. It allows parents to sometimes choose care for their children based on the quality of care rather than the cost. But, again, even the patch is wearing out.

Families who meet all the criteria to be eligible under title IV–A regulations are denied services simply because there is no money left in the pot, and that is a current fact in Olmsted County, Minn.

We have a temporary freeze on all requests for child care in licensed family day care until we can resolve the problem. There was no other choice, for if the county had continued to meet the increasing demands, the money allotted to Olmsted County under title IV–A would have been expended by the 1st of July, and all services would have to come to an end.

But even if title IV–A child care requests could be met, that alone does not answer the needs of the working poor.

A young divorced mother on AFDC with two preschool children has gone back to school. She is enrolled in a 9-month LPN vocational program. During this training period, her child care is paid for.

Her first month of work at the hospital is considered training, so her low income continues to make her eligible for reimbursement for child care.

But, now, the month is up. She is a fully qualified licensed practical nurse. She is earning $3 an hour, and she received $150 a month for child support, which gives her a gross monthly income of $669.40. She is no longer eligible for child care reimbursement, and she must begin paying a maximum of $8 a day—$168 a month—for child care for her two children, and that is after taxes. She really is better off returning to AFDC and staying home with her children. What creative means we

device to encourage and support families on their way to independence and a meaningful life.

In spite of our patchwork system, there always arises a glimmer of hope—and certainly we have some of this in Mondale's home State of Minnesota—a strong and growing family day care system in certain areas, interest, and growing development of planning and coordinating groups.

In fact, as I read this bill, I find it very familiar. Its purpose and goals sound almost like quotes from the articles of incorporation and bylaws of the Olmsted County Council for Coordinated Child Care, which I represent. Coordination of services—a community working together—does indeed result in improved quality and availability of this to children.

In addition, Rochester has one of the six pilot projects funded by State legislation in 1974 for early childhood and identification projects to be funded through the public schools.

Basically, these are screening and parent education projects. During the writing and passing of the legislation, there was a great deal of emphasis on the fact that these projects would not be controlled by public schools, but would have 50 percent parent advisory and policy setting boards and would work together with other agencies in the community and, indeed, this has happened in our project.

Our 4–C council serves as coordinator—the instruction of parents and children is contracted to a long-established private nonprofit preschool, the early and periodic screening is contracted to the public health department, and the school district involved gives us great moral support and disperses the funds.

So, although there are many good things happening, many unmet needs of children remain in Minnesota as well as across the country—preschool enrichment programs, health and nutritional needs, programs for the handicapped, parent education, planning and coordination of services so families are not lost in the maze of reaching whatever services exist, training for staff and family day care providers, equipment and adequate facilities.

How many years have we spent trying to justify these needs?

The facts are there, the statistics are there. Will we continue to avoid them? Will we continue to be satisfied with our present small attempts to improve the rearing of children—attempts that are worthy but woefully limited—or do we respond to the national emergency with the passage of the Child and Family Services Act of 1975?

My tone has been evangelical, it is true, but, to me, it falls far short of the fervor that the subject deserves. In rearing children, we write the future history of the world. We could start now to make that history a shining affirmation of what it means to be human.

Senator MONDALE. We have a Finance Committee hearing going on. They are receiving testimony on my bill.

Congressman Bell will preside.

[Mr. Bell assumed the chair.]

Mr. BELL. This is one of the few times I know where a Republican has chaired a gathering of this kind.

Thank you, Ms. Sherlock, for your statement.

In what ways do you think a child should benefit from a child development program?

Ms. SHERLOCK. In what ways should he benefit?

Mr. BELL. We cannot lose sight of the fact that, of course, helping children is our goal. What I would like to know is how do you think a child should benefit from a child development program?

Ms. SHERLOCK. Could you be more specific by what you mean by a child development program.

Are you talking about group child care, nursery school program—kindergarten——

Mr. BELL. Any program that involves a child's development.

Ms. SHERLOCK. A child development program might be a parent education program, a preschool program or group center. The main goal, I think, of a child development program is to develop a good self-image.

I think that is probably one of the most important things we can do for children.

Certainly some skills, whether learned in their home or in a preschool setting or a day care center, are also important. It should result in some skills that will better prepare him for adulthood.

Mr. BELL. Whatever figure is finally put in the budget for this program, you recognize, as I do, that it will not be possible to serve every child in America; we must make judgments as to which children should be served.

Should we put our emphasis in this legislation on serving all children, or should we restrict the number? Who should be eligible, and why?

Ms. SHERLOCK. That is a very difficult question for me to answer. I am not the right person to answer that, because I think all children should be served.

When you believe in something, and feel it is important—and I strongly believe that what happens to our children is very important—then it should be available for all children.

So it is very hard for me to say we should only serve part of the children. Even though I realize we have to be realistic.

We do not have millions and millions of dollars. But it is a difficult question to answer. Because all children have needs——

Mr. BELL. Ms. Sherlock, maybe we are not communicating.

You know today we have a very strict restriction on the budget. Budgetary problems are tough problems.

Ms. SHERLOCK. I am saying we need to change our priorities.

Mr. BELL. That may be so, and I probably agree with you. But, nevertheless, this matter has to be given consideration. We have to begin thinking in areas of what will be the greatest priority in this program, not the overall picture, because we might not be able to serve everyone. Do you see what I mean?

Ms. SHERLOCK. Going back to answer your question, you say people who are eligible, under what? Are you talking about low-income eligible, such as title XX?

Mr. BELL. I would think low income, obviously, would be the ones to be considered first.

Is there any way you might suggest they be selected?

Ms. SHERLOCK. Certainly, low income is an obvious priority. I see great advantage in having money available for a sliding fee scale so parents share the cost of the programs.

Mr. BELL. Should the division be at the near poor?

Ms. SHERLOCK. A sliding fee scale stretches money—cutoff can be higher. A sliding fee scale, I think, is a very important part of a child care program.

Mr. BELL. Should there be some requirement that they pay for part of the services?

Ms. SHERLOCK. Yes; partly, I think it is appropriate. I think parents feel they have more right to make decisions about their children, feel better about participating in, say, policy decisions on the boards when they are contributing some money, even if it is a very minimal amount on the cost of the child care.

Mr. BELL. I start with the assumption that no one will intentionally establish a program which is inferior.

Therefore, how can we determine what quality is?

Ms. SHERLOCK. Quality is hard to determine.

One of the best ways to monitor quality is not to monitor the program, but monitor children, what is happening to the child. I certainly agree we need standards.

There are certain basic things that determine quality, enough space, the training of the staff, good equipment. Those things are part of the day care standards.

The staff ratio, number of children to staff. Those are the easy things to control, if someone puts just a little effort into it.

There are some basic things, and beyond that quality is again difficult to monitor, and certainly it is essential. There are some obvious things that can be easily standardized and controlled.

Mr. BELL. The Head Start program is probably the largest model we have, simply because the most money has been spent on it.

Should we use the Head Start program and all of its supplemental services, professional personnel, methods and techniques as a yardstick to measure that quality which you were speaking of?

Ms. SHERLOCK. I think you are talking about extra staff people, a lot of supplemental services they have in their programs. I believe these are essentials for adequate child care.

Mr. BELL. You think these would be beneficial?

Ms. SHERLOCK. Of course.

Mr. BELL. I have more questions, Ms. Sherlock, that I will submit to you to be put in the record at a later time.

Would this be satisfactory to you?

Ms. SHERLOCK. Yes.

Mr. BELL. Please give them to the other two witnesses also.

Ms. SHERLOCK. Yes.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Ellwood and information referred to and subsequently supplied follow:]

March 12, 1975

TESTIMONY
before the
Senate Subcommittee on Children & Youth
and
House Select Subcommittee on Education

by

Ann Ellwood, Executive Director
Minnesota Early Learning Design
122 East Grant Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55403
612-338-0631

As Director of Minnesota Early Learning Design my perspective on the Child and Family Services Act is somewhat different from those who are concerned with services to children. My interest is in how this bill can provide services to parents that will result in better conditions for children.

Minnesota Early Learning Design (MELD) began in September of 1973 supported by a one year grant from Lilly Endowment, Inc., to examine current approaches to early learning, to explore alternative delivery methods, and to develop a proposal for a demonstration project that could strengthen the family and be supportive of parents in their efforts to raise their children.

In order to quickly learn the major issues and current thinking of professionals, providers and consumers in the wide range of human services that relate to family life, a planning strategy was adopted that included visitation of programs and consultation nationally and locally, multidisciplinary conference attendance, and a reading plan. An eight member Parent Advisory Committee, representing a cross section of occupation, income, sex, race and life styles was established to assist the staff.

We found that educational programs that teach parents to teach their children are more effective and produce longer lasting gains than programs that concentrate on the

child alone. Moreover, many researchers believe that the first 2 or 3 years are the most critical in the life of the child - a period of time when services for children are traditionally not available.

We found that external pressures on the family are overwhelming. Changing patterns of living and working, mobility, loss of the extended family ties, lack of education for parenting combined with universal problems of jobs, housing and education place an extraordinarily heavy burden on young adults.

But we also found a renewed consciousness of the crucial nature of child rearing skills on the part of caregivers, program personnel, researchers and policy makers. The result is a rapid expansion of interest in programs regarding "parenting" or "parent education."

In surveying parent education services available it became clear that several significant elements are not being addressed; programs are generally too short, too late and too expensive. The duration of programs is usually too short to make a long lasting impact. Services usually begin too late in the life of the child to be a preventive force. While a few programs are free or low cost, substantial fees are frequently charged, inhibiting the wide distribution of service to those who need and want them. And although most programs provide information and a few offer emotional support to parents, these two elements (felt by MELD to be of utmost importance in combination) are not provided in a continuous fashion.

Parents (and often mothers alone), essentially without assistance, are doing a remarkably good job with a great lack of preparation, with little information, under great stress and with insufficent psychological support from the community.

As MELD sought to analyze how parents seek and receive information and support, we became aware of a timely movement across the country which appears to offer a unique opportunity for parent education. Peer self help groups are fellowships organized around a common problem, groups in which one person who has been through an experience helps other persons who are currently undergoing the experience. They provide effective personal psychology with high public acceptance for a wide and growing array of human

problems. The method has been in use for decades by Alcoholics Anonymous and Synanon to treat severe social and psychological problems. More recently it has been adopted to address personal problems that society does not define so harshly. Recently for a growing number of people with more typical problems in common, it is the method of choice for providing psychological support, education and sometimes recreation.

Peer self help groups have certain common characteristics. In addition to being peers, leaders are usually volunteers. Occasionally the volunteers are trained, especially in support techniques and group dynamics. In some groups professional backup and advice is available to leaders and to the groups as well. Often leaders have their own support groups to offer encouragement and reinforcement. Most peer self help groups have open memberships. Meetings can be attended by anyone who designates himself as sharing the common problem. In the case of local groups such as Alcoholics Anonymous, Weight Watchers and a divorce counseling group, sufficent numbers of groups exist so that individuals can attend any parallel group that meets. Usually, however, the interpersonal relationships help to keep members in their own groups.

Because the coordinator has experienced and successfullly negotiated the difficult problem faced by others in the group, he/she can provide effective role models that bring encouragement and hope. Self disclosure techniques encourage identification and empathy in peers. Available to group members even beyond the scheduled meetings, leaders can offer advice and problem solving support. In many peer self help groups leaders are carefully trained to model, reward and reinforce supportive behavior in others. By participating in common activities and endeavors members gain insight into common problems and problem behaviors, and develop positive sharing relationships which offer personal growth, improved self image, and greater self confidence to overcome the present difficulties. Another common outcome of such groupings is that peers help each other by sharing information about community resources - jobs, services, bargains, housing.

Reduced costs and de-emphasis of professional involvement partially explain the wide acceptance of the movement. But perhaps the most compelling reason may be that this

is a simple, non-controversial, natural way to prevent social problems by helping one another. Americans value concepts of self help as well as peer involvement. A woman who has successfully nursed an infant happily shares and teaches another who wishes to do so. The slim, self assured former fatty is a model and support to others feeling the burden of excess weight.

Can peer self help groups be used effectively for parent education? Do the proper elements exist to create the appropriate relationships? Can education be combined with psychological support?

The birth of the first child is very often a crisis because of lack of information, isolation, fear and other societal pressures. To encourage the development of peer self helps groups to address parental needs is to build on a natural support relationship of parents helping parents that has always existed. Volunteer parents who have been extensively trained in psychological support, reinforcement techniques and group dynamics, as well as an overview of child development, cognitive and physical development, health care, nutrition, safety and community resources can build on these natural patterns and can help develop optimal behavior in parents.

Using the peer self help approach, MELD will provide information and support to small groups of 15 parents, both male and female, beginning early in the first pregnancy. Other parents who are specially trained volunteers will lead the groups which will be open to all parents. MELD believes that such a plan will prove to be inexpensive, easily replicable and attractive to parents who need and desire resources as they raise their children.

I endorse the Child and Family Services Act because it addresses the problem of supports to families as they raise their children. It offers flexibility to accomodate innovations--new program ideas such as ours. Equally significant is the freedom the bill provides to parents to choose from available program options, protecting their authority over the care of their children, helping them to shoulder their responsibilities while maintaining control over their children's preschool years.

(4)

March 18, 1975

Mr. Jack Duncan
Sub-Committee on Select Education
2178 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Mr. Duncan,

Attached are my responses to the questions relating to the Child and Family Services Bills of 1975, H.R. 2966 and S. 626, presented by Congressman Alphonzo Bell during the hearings before the Senate Sub-Committees on Children and Youth, and Labor, Poverty and Employment and the House Select Sub-Committee on Education on March 12, 1975. I hope the responses will be useful to Congressman Bell.

It was a privilege to participate in the hearings. I sincerely hope these important bills will pass.

Sincerely,

Edwina L. Hertzberg

Edwina L. Hertzberg
Executive Director

ELH:ks
cc: Mr. A. Sidney Johnson, III

Greater Minneapolis Day Care Association

Edwina L. Hertzberg, Executive Director 430 Oak Grove Suite 310 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55403 612/332-0671

Response to questions of Congressman Alphonzo Bell relating to the Child and Family Services Bill of 1975, H.R. 2966 and S. 626; prepared by Edwina L. Hertzberg, Executive Director of the Greater Minneapolis Day Care Association:

1. WHATEVER FIGURE IS FINALLY PUT INTO THE BUDGET FOR THIS PROGRAM, YOU RECOGNIZE AS I DO THAT IT WILL NOT BE POSSIBLE TO SERVE EVERY CHILD IN AMERICA AND THAT WE MUST MAKE JUDGMENTS AS TO WHICH CHILDREN SHOULD BE SERVED.

   A. SHOULD WE PUT OUR EMPHASIS IN THIS LEGISLATION ON SERVING ALL CHILDREN, OR SHOULD WE RESTRICT THE NUMBER WHO ARE ELIGIBLE? PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY.

      Not all families will want and need services. But services should be available to all families who want and need them. Developmental needs of children cut across all socio-economic levels. Roads are available to all; no income is required in order to be defended by services provided through the defense department. Surely all children should have opportunity for maximum growth and development.

   B. HOW SHOULD CHILDREN BE SELECTED?

      Children should be selected on the basis of desire of families to be served.

   C. SHOULD ONLY POOR CHILDREN BE SERVED?

      No.

   D. SHOULD SERVICES BE PROVIDED FOR THE "NEAR-POOR"?

      Yes.

   E. SHOULD CHILDREN WHOSE PARENTS (OR PARENT) WHO ARE ABOVE THE POVERTY LINE BE ALLOWED

Greater Minneapolis Day Care Association

Edwina L. Hertzberg, Executive Director 430 Oak Grove Suite 810 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55403 612/332-0871

TO PARTICIPATE IN THESE PROGRAMS? -- IF YES, UNDER WHAT CONDITIONS?

Families should be allowed to participate on an equitable sliding fee basis for those able to pay.

F. DOES EVERY CHILD WHO COMES FROM A FAMILY BELOW THE POVERTY LEVEL REQUIRE CHILD CARE SERVICES?

All children and families require services to provide opportunity for healthy growth and development. But service needs will vary from family to family.

2. THE LAST QUESTIONS PERTAINED TO QUANTITY OR NUMBERS TO SERVE. THESE QUESTIONS REFER TO THE QUALITY OF PROGRAMS. I START WITH THE ASSUMPTION THAT NO ONE WILL INTENTIONALLY ESTABLISH A PROGRAM WHICH IS "INFERIOR." THEREFORE:

A. HOW CAN WE DETERMINE WHAT QUALITY IS?

An important and difficult question, again varying from family to family. However, a "quality" program meets the child's developmental needs -- cognitive, physical, nutritional, social, emotional. Program components can be measured as such other variables relating to quality such as staff-child interaction, staff training, staff-child ratio, administration-staff ratio, etc.

B. THE HEAD START PROGRAM IS THE LARGEST MODEL AVAILABLE SIMPLY BECAUSE THE MOST MONEY IS SPENT ON IT. SHOULD WE USE THE HEAD START PROGRAM AND ALL OF ITS SUPPLEMENTAL SERVICES, PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL, METHODS, AND TECHNIQUES AS A YARD-STICK TO MEASURE QUALITY?

It is one measure. However, the focus of Head Start is on cognitive development and is geared to preparing a child for school.

C. ARE ALL OF THOSE SERVICES AND ALL OF THOSE PEOPLE REALLY NECESSARY, AND DO THEY, IN THEMSELVES, CONSTITUTE OR GUARANTEE QUALITY?

The availability of these services is necessary if the child's

development is the primary concern.

No one component guarantees quality; all of them together, with adequate parent policy-making and competent staff direction maximizes opportunity for quality.

D. SHOULD HEAD START BE THE MODEL FOR ALL PROGRAMS DEVELOPED UNDER THIS LEGISLATION? IF YOUR ANSWER IS NO, PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY AND EXPLAIN THE REASONS WHY YOU THINK IT IS NOT ADEQUATE. IF YOUR ANSWER IS YES, DO YOU AGREE THAT IF HEAD START IS SO GOOD, SHOULD WE SIMPLY AMEND THE HEAD START LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE SERVICES TO ALL CHILDREN AND NOT HAVE TO DEAL THROUGH THIS LEGISLATION.

No. Head Start is one model of children's services. Services should reflect the philosophy, value system and life style of the family. It is not the model suitable for every child, every family, every community -- there is no one model of child development program suitable for all families. Standards set at the federal level can assure flexibility of program within a basic program framework.

E. ARE SOCIAL WORKERS, PSYCHOLOGISTS, NUTRITIONISTS, AND OTHER SPECIALISTS REALLY NECESSARY? PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY.

Such specialists must be available to assure that children's needs are being met either through the family or with program services.

F. SHOULD EDUCATIONAL ENRICHMENT BE A MANDATORY PART OF ANY CHILD CARE PROGRAM? TO WHAT EXTENT?

Yes, to the extent desired by the parents utilizing a program.

G. SHOULD NEW FACILITIES BE CONSTRUCTED, OR SHOULD EXISTING BUILDINGS BE USED? SHOULD THERE BE ANY RESTRICTIONS PLACED ON FINANCING IN THIS AREA?

In some areas, licensing requirements are such that rehabilitation becomes non-productive and costly. Often areas needing services most are those in older parts of a city with buildings inadequate for licensing or rehabilitation. If cost and program productive, existing buildings should be utilized where possible. If new buildings are to be constructed, sharing arrangements may be arranged with local public systems.

H. ARE PROFESSIONALS NECESSARY TO OPERATE THESE PROGRAMS, OR CAN PARA OR NON-PROFESSIONALS DO THE JOB AS WELL?

A balance of staff appears to be the best approach. Competent supervision is essential. Again, staff should reflect program philosophy.

I. WHAT IS THE IDEAL WORKER TO CHILD RATIO. PLEASE EXPLAIN YOUR ANSWER.

There is no absolute answer at the present time. However, children served by IV-A programs, by definition, are generally from multi-problem families. Different communities, different programs apparently can successfully utilize different ratios. However, on the average, Federal Day Care Standards appear to be appropriate for most programs.

J. SHOULD PARENTS BE INVOLVED IN THE PROGRAMS? HOW AND TO WHAT EXTENT SHOULD THEY BE EMPLOYED?

If they so desire. Parents should be encouraged to be involved on all levels from policy-making to program participation.

K. SHOULD CHILDREN BE SERVED ONE, TWO, OR THREE MEALS A DAY? HOW MANY SNACKS?

Number of meals appropriate depends upon length of time a child is present daily. Primary concern should be for nutritional balance. For the sake of opportunity for family interaction, at least one meal should be in the home with the family. Therefore, in most cases, two meals plus two snacks would be optimum.

L. HOW MANY HOURS A DAY SHOULD CENTERS BE OPEN?

Again, depending upon community needs, full day care programs should be open 10 hours per day. Half-day programs generally run 2-1/2 hours and serve enrichment purposes. Twenty-four hour care is needed in most communities and seldom available.

M. WHAT TYPE OF PROGRAM DOES A CHILD REALLY NEED IN ORDER TO ACHIEVE A MAXIMUM EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE?

One which meets the child's developmental needs -- cognitive, social, emotional, physical, nutritional.

3. POSSIBLY THE MOST IMPORTANT QUESTION THAT I CAN ASK PERTAINS TO THE PROGRAM DELIVERY SYSTEM. BECAUSE ANY CHILD WHO ENTERS A PRESCHOOL PROGRAM WILL EVENTUALLY ATTEND PUBLIC SCHOOL, I BELIEVE THERE SHOULD BE SOME WORKING RELATIONSHIP WITH THE LOCAL PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

A. IN YOUR OPINION WHAT SPECIFIC ROLE SHOULD THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS HAVE IN ANY LEGISLATION WE DEVELOP? PLEASE EXPLAIN YOUR REASONS.

There should be formalized interaction between child development programs and public schools. School space should be made available as feasible to child development programs.

B. SHOULD THE SCHOOLS HAVE THE PRIMARY ROLE IN CHILD DEVELOPMENT?

No. The family should and does have the primary role in child development.

C. SHOULD THE SCHOOLS HAVE A SUPPLEMENTARY ROLE? IF SO, TO WHAT DEGREE?

School space and services should be utilized. School systems should run child care programs only if controlled by parents.

Mr. BELL. I am sorry I was not here to listen to the entire panel, but I had a previous commitment.

The next panel is a panel of women's organizations, Andrey Colom, vice chairwoman, National Women's Political Caucus; Mary Grace Plaskett, national chairperson of task force on child care, National Organization for Women; Carol Burris, president, Women's Lobby, Inc.; Arvonne Fraser, legislative chairperson and past president, Women's Equity Action League; and Sandy Hill, national vice president, Federally Employed Women.

Welcome, ladies, to the committee.

You can start any way you like. The first name we have listed is Audrey Colom, but you can decide among yourselves how you wish to testify.

STATEMENT OF AUDREY COLOM, VICE CHAIRWOMAN, NATIONAL WOMEN'S POLITICAL CAUCUS, ACCOMPANIED BY MARY GRACE PLASKETT, NATIONAL CHAIRPERSON OF TASK FORCE ON CHILD CARE, NATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR WOMEN; CAROL BURRIS, PRESIDENT, WOMEN'S LOBBY, INC.; ARVONNE FRASER, LEGISLATIVE CHAIRPERSON AND PAST PRESIDENT, WOMEN'S EQUITY ACTION LEAGUE; SANDY HILL, NATIONAL VICE PRESIDENT, FEDERALLY EMPLOYED WOMEN; AND JULIE KISIELEWSKI, A PANEL

Ms. COLOM. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I am pleased to be here today to discuss the child and family services legislation.

My name is Audrey Colom. I am a parent of a preschool child currently in day care, and vice chairwoman of the National Women's Political Caucus. NWPC represents over 30,000 women. We have 300 State and local caucuses across the Nation. We are a multipartisan and multi-issue group.

The prompt enactment of the child and family services bill is one of two top legislative priorities for the National Women's Political Caucus for 1975.

As an indication of how strongly our membership feels about the need for bills, such as S. 626 and H.R. 2966, the caucus leadership voted at its past January meeting to devote a substantial effort to helping the child care bills pass Congress.

I offer this as evidence of how important this legislation is to one of the country's fastest growing women's organizations.

I know that previous witnesses, particularly Carmen Maymi, Director, Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor, and Joseph Reid, executive director of the Child Welfare League of America, have statistically documented the role of women in the labor force and the paucity of child care facilities. I will not reiterate the figures, but they are summarized at the end of my statement for our reference today.

What do all these figures about the increasing number of women in the labor force, the female headed households, and the scarcity of licensed child care facilities tell us?

They all tell us the same thing, the need for federally funded child care programs exists now, today. Women, mothers, are out of the home

working, mostly because they must make ends meet. Many are heads of families, solely responsible for supporting their children. There is no alternative for these women. Their children must be cared for. And the child care programs, whether for preschoolers or school-aged children, are inadequate because society's institutions have not adjusted to changing customs.

At this point, I would like to leave my prepared statement and share with you my personal frustrations seeking child care within the present institutional framework.

When my daughter was born, I was a junior in college. Prior to the beginning of my senior year, I sought child care. Because she was only 6 months old, I was told to seek a home care situation. I was given a list of homes to visit, which I did. I found none of these infant care homes adequate to meet my child's needs.

Reluctantly, I took my daughter to live with my parents in New York. My husband and I visited New York every weekend for 6 months so that our daughter would not forget her parents.

When we brought her back to Washington, we tried several different home care placements. For 2½ years, my child was placed in custodial day care homes because there was no alternative for children under 3.

My child is now in a child development program helping her to develop the skills necessary to grow emotionally and intellectually. This program, like all good programs, needs your help. Presently, they have a waiting list of 42 children.

These 42 children need and deserve quality care. I think the child and family services legislation can help them.

I would, at this point, like to speak up for the small percentage of women who work out of choice, not necessity. They and their children, too, deserve the highest quality care available.

I am pleased that the Senate bill provides some space on a sliding fee basis in child care programs for families above the Bureau of Labor Statistics lower living standard budget. I know that these families desire for their children the rich and varied experience that the best child care programs offer, and they are prepared to pay for these programs.

To those people who bristle at the mention of day care and equate it with irresponsible or neglectful parents, I would like to say that good—not custodial—care, day care is quality education.

The children are learning about themselves, their playmates, their environment in a happy, healthy way. They are growing and developing as a result of their experience in a day care program.

Second, I would like to remind the opponents of this legislation that all the programs and services offered are completely voluntary.

This legislation does not say that because a child care program for preschoolers opens in your community that you must enroll your 3-year-old. Nor does it say that because an afterschool program for junior high students is started in your child's school that your child must attend.

Those who do not desire or approve of the service need not avail themselves. There will be enough people rushing to use it, as it is.

Now, I would just like to take a couple of minutes to speak about specific provisions of the two bills, S. 626 and H.R. 2966.

I am distressed that, for the first year, funds are authorized only for planning, training, and technical assistance—groundwork funds. While I do not dispute that ample planning must be done. I am surprised that no money is simultaneously available for already existing child care and family service programs—especially those suffering from diminishing foundation or local government support.

I can think of several child care programs, within walking distance of this very hearing room, that may close down soon because their funding is unstable.

If this bill passes as drafted, I can envision a situation where well-paid planners are scouring the country determining areas of greatest need, while child care programs in those very areas are cutting back or closing down altogether.

Children must be the primary beneficiaries of this money.

I would like to commend you for recognizing the important role that parents must play on the child and family service councils. I think that concern has been expressed at previous hearings that working parents may be too busy to attend council meetings and should, therefore, have a limited role in the child and family service councils. I do not believe this is true.

In fact, many parents already do participate actively in planning for their children, and given the opportunity, even more would participate.

As a parent, I realize that, like everyone, we make mistakes and we need experts' advice, but, in the end, we do know our own children better than anyone else. Parents must comprise at least one-half of the membership of the child and family service councils as the bills currently provide.

In closing, I would like to thank you for holding hearings so promptly on the child and family service bills.

I hope that the full committees and the full Congress will act with the same awareness of the needs and expeditiously pass the bills into laws.

[The following information was supplied for the record by Ms. Colom:]

SOME STATISTICS ON WOMEN IN THE LABOR FORCE

1. There are 27 million children under 18 whose mothers are in the labor force.
2. There are 6 million children under 6 with mothers in the labor force.
3. Since 1960 the percent of married women with children under 6 in the labor force has risen from 18.6% to 34%.
4. 34% of the married women with children under 6 are in the labor force.
5. Two thirds of the women in the work force are single, divorced, separated or have husbands earning under $7,000.
5. Two thirds of the women in the work force are single, divorced, separated if the mother worked and only $3,760 if the mother didn't work.
7. It is estimated that there are only one million places in licensed day care centers and homes for the 6 million pre-school children with working mothers.
8. It is estimated that one and one half million AFDC children under 6 are in "unknown child care arrangements".

Mr. BELL. Thank you, Ms. Colom, for an excellent statement.

Who would like to speak next?

We can go down the list.

Mary Grace Plaskett.

Ms. PLASKETT. Thank you, Mr. Bell.

I am Mary Grace Plaskett, the Child Care Task Force coordinator for the National Organization for Women. I am delighted to be here today to speak on NOW's behalf in support of the Child and Family Services Act.

The position of the National Organization for Women regarding child care is one which we feel reaches out to the realistic needs of children, parents, and employers. This position might best be illustrated point by point.

1. That every child deserves the highest quality education and care that our society can provide from infancy through preparation for a career. This is a basic right of each child in America and should be demonstrated by national support and funding for early childhood education and development schools, in which each child is encouraged to explore her or his environment and to learn independence and the democratic process of decisionmaking. Each child must be encouraged to develop to her or his full and individual potential, free from sex role stereotyping, racial, ethnic, cultural, and economic bias.

2. That the development of such schools will offer all parents the opportunity to support their families, to pursue their own education, careers or the development of their own individual potential without guilt or fear that their children are not being adequately cared for.

3. That such publicly supported early childhood education schools must be available at flexible hours to meet the needs of families.

4. That such schools provide adequate nutritional and health services to meet the needs of the children that are enrolled.

5. That parents of children enrolled in these schools have some decisionmaking and control of the administration, curriculum and operation of that school.

6. That such schools be open to all children, regardless of financial standing of parents. These schools should contain a cross-section of children of poor, middle and upper incomes so that no child is "ghettoized" because of the economic background of her/his parents.

7. That licensing and regulatory procedures on the Federal, State and local levels must be revised so they foster, rather than impede, the rapid growth of high quality child care and development programs.

8. That Government support of a coordinated network of developmental and educational early child schools be an immediate national priority. Funds need to be available for operation, training, technical assistance, research and demonstration, renovation and, especially, construction.

Money available for construction would serve a dual purpose—while giving a boost to the economy by channeling money into the construction field, we would be providing environments specifically designed to stimulate children's imagination and curiosity, with all the safety features necessary for the well-being of those children.

I do not come armed with a large number of statistics, since these statistics usually speak to the need in terms of the "working mothers." In my opinion, such statistics do not address the more realistic and universal need in our society for adequate child care and development for all children, regardless of race, socioeconomic background, or occupation of parents.

I would like to speak to the needs of the children and parents involved and ask if any of us here today, who are obviously concerned

about child care, have ever asked the children how they feel? I do. I ask continually.

I am employed as the executive director/school coordinator of the South Hills NOW Day Nursery School in Pittsburgh, Pa.

I have seen the children enrolled in a quality educational center grow physically, mentally, and emotionally. I ask them if they like school. Then I ask them why they like school. Let me share with you their responses.

Heather says, "Cause we get to paint here * * * I don't have paints at home and they're messy. No one yells that it's getting on the floor. * * *" She turns from the easel to show me her work, half of which is on the paper and the other half on her nose, shoes, and floor.

Elizabeth says, "Debbie," her teacher, "says I can start my second reading book on Friday." Elizabeth's major joy and challenge in the world is being able to read "all by myself, any time I want to."

Scott says, "Because Moss," one of the other children, "is here and lots of other kids and lots of things to do."

These three statements form in my mind the basic reasons for support for child care—the availability of learning and developmental equipment and a staff trained in directing the children in its use and the freedom to use it, and the social companionship so necessary for children. Children enjoy being with other children.

It puts a great strain on children to be expected to cope in an adult world solely with adults 24 hours a day. Wise parents are those who realize that they cannot be everything, all day, every day, to their child.

I have daily opportunity to discuss with parents their needs and feelings about child care. From these parents I get a variety of reactions.

The parent who, because he or she is a single parent, must work outside the home to support a family, is often overwhelmed by guilt. This comes, I believe, from an historic apprehension that a child is best emotionally provided for by one parent, the female, in a 1-to-1 relationship in the home; that, except for the conventional 2½-hour nursery school program, any child denied such treatment for the remaining 21½ hours a day is emotionally deprived and may be traumatized for life.

Not wanting to emotionally cripple their children, these parents are emotionally crippling themselves, and are forced to deny themselves a career which they could find fulfilling, or necessary to avoid the welfare rolls.

Some parents try to substitute the parent within the home by hiring a person, usually a female, and paying less than a living wage to provide child care. Because the salary is generally less than minimum wage, the turnover is great and the reliability is less than adequate. Unfortunately, it is very often the case that the quality of time and energy of this adult is directed elsewhere, while a child is, in fact, being "baby-sat" by a television set.

Often in two-parent households, parents work on different shifts, taking turns watching the children while one sleeps or while sleeping themselves. Again, the quality of care for the children suffers and the child is forced or encouraged to sit in front of a television set with a reprimand to "Be quiet, I'm trying to get some sleep."

In extreme financial stress, often the parent turns to his or her parents or relatives to provide this service and creates the problem of a generally aging parent raising a second family.

Offering stimulating learning experiences for young children is a very time-consuming and energy-consuming task, and while most older adults enjoy being with young children for awhile, a steady demand on these adults for constant attention is wearing.

There are other parents, the statistics show, who leave their preschool children in the care of other children, or completely unattended. There are too many latchkey children in our country.

These children, ages 4 to 12, carry a house or apartment key on a string around their necks in order to "let themselves in and take care of themselves, younger children, and household duties" until a parent returns from work. If comprehensive child care and development, including before and after school care, were available to all children whose families seek it, these problems could be eliminated.

Employers have also voiced their concern for the provision of adequate child care. It is generally felt that the productivity of working parents could be substantially increased if those parents could be free from anxiety and the interruption of their schedules caused by inadequate or unreliable care.

Let me emphasize that early childhood education is a basic right of all children, regardless of their parents' financial status. We think that we must make every effort to serve the needs of all young children.

They should be offered the same open policy which is given to their older brothers and sisters in our public schools. They could be achieved by the allocation of Federal and State funds to establish an early childhood education program in each State. This would allow and insure that all children receive the same quality educational and developmental program regardless of their parents' socioeconomic background. This program would also provide standards for professionals and paraprofessionals and would increase the labor force.

Were a program like this implemented, the licensing of these schools would logically fall under the States' Departments of Education.

Since the department of education is responsible for the standards of teacher training, there could be a closer cooperation between teachers' colleges and early childhood education schools in order to equip teachers to meet the children's needs more realistically.

Quality early childhood education would be achieved with the maximum number of children served in a safe healthy environment.

Mr. BELL. Thank you, Ms. Plaskett.

[The following information was subsequently supplied for the record:]

Mr. BELL. I am wondering, for the sake of time, if the remaining witnesses could summarize your statements, and we will put the full statements in the record. This would be helpful because we do have another panel that has to come before us. Time is running short.

Ms. Burris, if you could summarize.

Ms. BURRIS. Fine.

I am Carol Burris. I am President of the Women's Lobby.

I think there are three things that my statement really touches on: The first is the whole question of why it is that we have a large number of households headed by women, a large number of women in the work force that are completely ignored.

This bill was passed, first, in 1971, and it was vetoed. These children are still with us and they are still not getting any care.

We are sitting here once again, all of us who agree on the need and all of us who agree that there is a need and we agree there ought to be funding. We are all sitting down once again and I notice that none of the people who disagree with us are here.

We are all discussing, once again, this problem.

In the meantime, as the mother of a child who was a preschooler when this bill first passed, I am now the mother of a second grader. If we keep on at this pace, I am going to be the grandmother of somebody who needs child care.

Second: We have a continual problem with HEW about implementing this bill. A lot of the opposition comes from there.

Frankly, if the Secretary of HEW were a woman and she were to announce that she could not do her job, and then expect that there was a good and sufficient reason to not take care of the children who need day care, like any woman who goes around and announces she cannot do her job she would be fired.

I think it is a poor excuse that the Secretary of HEW feels that he should be able to come before this committee and continuously announce that he is unable to administer a program to take care of children, and then feel that is good and sufficient reason not to enact one.

It is probably good and sufficient reason to change Secretaries.

The third thing that concerns me is the distribution of resources for children. When the Vice President's hearings on his nominations were held, I notice that no one said to you, "Do you feel really and truly deprived because, as a child, you had care by people other than your parents?"

That did not become an issue. There were a lot of issues in Rockefeller's nomination. That was not one. That is true of all people who are well off enough to be able to afford individual in-home personal care for their children.

My mother worked all of her life. Never, never was the problem ever raised that any of us were turning out to be disturbed monsters because we had household help.

I think it is interesting when the middle-class children, particularly working class children, where both parents have to work, when any attempt is made to give them any sort of assistance with the tax dollars that they pay—and they are the tax base in this country—then immediately we are all worrying about how these children are going to be traumatized. If it is good enough for Nelson Rockefeller, I am sure it is good enough for the rest of us.

The other thing that is really important in discussing child care is the whole question of why this problem can continually be put underneath.

Why those of us who are middle income parents are sort of left alone. I think when there are no services which is the current case, there is no way to buy the kind of services that are available for Audrey's daughter or my son, because they just do not exist.

My son is in a school program with 15 other children, and the competition to get into these programs is far greater than it will ever be to get them into Harvard or Yale, because they have about a thousand spaces for their freshman class, not 15 spaces.

You cannot tell me that the poor people need spaces more than anybody else does, because there are just no spaces that exist.

So the need is equally great for all of us, because we just do not have any commitment publicly to take care of our children.

I think that we have to really say that there just is a tremendous need to increase the funding in this bill to not have 1-year planning session, but to move immediately into the bill and really do with funding what is realistic. That is when this bill was vetoed in 1971, 4 years have passed, the inflation rate has been extraordinarily high, and we cannot now cut back because of the veto message of a President who has left the White House our demands for the children who we know that are out there.

If we do, I think as somebody who works on women's rights, I have to say, I think it can only exist because the Congress of the United States think that women take care of children, that is a free service, and there is no point in replacing a free service with one costing money. It is really exploiting women as well as exploiting the children.

Mr. BELL. Thank you, Ms. Burris.

You believe that there should be no problem regarding the budget, that this program should get top priority, and it does not make any difference whether you are poor or near poor?

Nobody should get priority. Everyone should have these services, is that correct?

Ms. BURRIS. Yes, I think just like the kind of problems that I work on as a lobbyist, there is no question in my mind that we cut out other sorts of problems.

If you look at early and periodic screening and detection programs, Congressman Metcalfe asked GAO to study that program. Less than 3 percent of screening and innoculation because HEW has never implemented the program.

If we took the money that is supposed to be going to Southeast Asia, we could treat every child in Illinois under this program, every child.

And there is no reason, it seems to me, that we have any commitment doing something else with that money when we cannot take care of our own children.

Mr. BELL. Of course, you and I do not set the budget for the Nation. There are constraints and limits on the budget.

Under such circumstances, you have to establish priorities.

What do you believe would be a proper amount that a mother should have to pay if she was able to pay?

In other words, you obviously know the poor are not going to able to pay. The near poor probably are not either. But there are going to be some—the middle class—that might have to pay.

What do you think would be the proper amount?

Ms. BURRIS. If you look at our constituency as people involved in women's rights, the median income for women is literally half what it is for men. The median income for women is around $5,000. For white men it is around $10,000. For black men it is around $8,000.

Anyone of us, by finding a man, a live man walking around, doubles our income.

I had a list, and you can see how many female headed households live in poverty. If you are talking about our constituency, those of us at this table, if you take the social service, title XX guidelines, there is no question in my mind that all working women, with the exception of maybe 1 or 2 percent at the very top, are going to easily be able to qualify for free care.

Then the question of deciding which woman is going to get it is one that I do not see I have to make. I just think that it is my responsibility to tell this committee of the need.

Mr. BELL. Of course, these are the questions that come right back to us, and we are going to have to make the decisions.

There is just so much money to go around.

Ms. BURRIS. I think I would put the top 10 in whatever title XX is.

Mr. BELL. I did not hear you.

Ms. BURRIS. The title XX guidelines of 115 percent of need at the top. That comes out to about $15,000 in New York City. That is well over what any woman on the average is going to make.

Those would fit within our guidelines of having to explain the need and have as the first set of need those women who are heads of households.

I think from there you need some sort of sliding scale that in the end does not really have a tremendous burden on those families where two people work, if they work at middle-class jobs, the people that Audrey said are those people that work out of choice.

There the problem is that we do not have a tax credit or easy access to tax deductions that are available for those of us who pay for child care.

So if it were a credit system, because many more people file short form than file long form, or if it were a system of credit even for home care, which it is not now, you would at least be able to give me the kind of deductions from my business expense, because I cannot be here today without child care.

You give people who buy business lunches—I really resent paying for martinis and getting nothing for child care.

I think if you had it as a system without limit, it is now $28,000 as a limit, if you take the limit off, as you do with other business expenses, then at least those of us who are middle income are going to be able to get back the amount of money that we must spend as a business expense with child care.

Mr. BELL. Thank you, Ms. Burris, for your excellent comments. I think it is very important that we discuss these points.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Burris follows:]

STATEMENT OF CAROL BURRIS, PRESIDENT
WOMEN'S LOBBY, INC.
SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
U. S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
AND THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH
AND THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT, POVERTY, AND MIGRATORY LABOR
UNITED STATES SENATE

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES BILL

MARCH 12, 1975

Chairman Brademas and Chairman Mondale, members of the subcommittees, I am Carol Burris, President of Women's Lobby, Inc. The Lobby is a national organization with affiliates in forty states. We work solely on legislation pertaining to women. It is a privilege to appear before you today.

We are here today on behalf of all the millions of women who can't find suitable child care. We feel that all women are entitled to sound, flexible programs available to them and their children. Economic necessity is a fact of life for all women, but those women in better circumstances financially are no better off than their poor sisters because no amount of money can buy what does not exist. And really good day care - because all around child care is in the future - is so scarce that the pressure on three and four year olds is greater than on Harvard freshmen because Harvard has many more than the fifteen to fifty spaces.

Perhaps we should talk about the need: Between 1969 and 1972, the number of households headed by women increased by 60%! There is a 14% increase in the number of women working who have children under the age of six - in just the last three years. 54% of all women workers have children between

the ages of 6 and 16. Two thirds of the women in the work force are single, separated, divorced, widowed, or have husbands who earn less than $7,000 a year.

If you're a child in a female headed household, your mother only earns 4[illegible]% of the median income of families with two parents and her income declined between 1969 and 1972. 70% of all black families and 60% of all white families that receive food stamps are headed by women.

11% of all families, but
42% of all poverty level families...
34% of all black families, but
65% of all poor-black families...
24% of all Puerto Rican families, but
43% of all poor Puerto Rican families...
9.5 of all Chicano families, but
4% of all poor Chicana families are headed by women.

In San Antonio, Texas, a study at Our Lady of the Lake College showed that 50% of all the spanish speaking children died before their first birthday. The EPSDT program for Medicaid eligible children should provide innoculations and screening. Congressman Metcalfe (D, Ill.) discovered from a G.A.O. study that less than 3% of the ten million eligible children have been served.

Our infant and maternal mortality rates are a disgrace. The only decline in recent years have been with an increase in abortion rates for teenage mothers and older women. Yet the staunchest opponents of legalized abortion have not supported this legislation nor have they supported the Mondale bill to end child abuse. There is something truly evil about this kind of contrast. Are we only willing to feed and care for children before birth?

Let me add some information about the 9.7% of women who are unemployed. Certainly they need and deserve the attention

of this Congress. But I refuse to believe that 100 men in the Senate and 417 men in the House cannot cope with more than one national problem at a time. It is demeaning to all women to hear the shrewd analysis that claims that this bill can go nowhere because we want those women to stay on welfare and not get jobs because there now are no jobs. If we had no more committment to child care than to force women into the work force, we certainly cannot cope with this problem.

We want to commend both of you for your farsightedness and tenacity in working on this problem for the last five years. It is a real pleasure to see the sex discrimination amendments in the bill. Although the ratio of spaces is highly tilted toward services to the poor, if the income figures from your social services legislation is used, you will cover almost all the women in the work force.

The funding levels in the bill seem very low. When the appropriations process is finished, the average authorization is cut by 40%. Because of resistance to new programs, this bill might be cut more severly. Tactically, I would like to urge a larger authorization because I am sure that everyone sacrifices for their children. A tax sacrifice that you can use, especially for your children, is not irksome. But a tax sacrifice that you don't see or use is a burden when you have the same problem in lack of care.

If the five years we have all waited for child care, HEW has shown itself no more ready to move or be prepared. They announce that they cannot do their job and are smug. No women would do that without facing unemployment. It is time to move without them. Thank you.

###

57-640 O - 76 - pt. 3 - 4

Mr. BELL. Ms. Fraser, would you like to go next, and could you summarize, if possible?

Ms. FRASER. Yes. In fact, I will not even summarize, I will just submit my statement and go to this question of cost.

Mr. BELL. Your prepared statement will be printed in the record at the conclusion of testimony of the panel.

Ms. FRASER. This is a good bill, I think, because it includes lots of child care services that are needed for children, whether they are in day care institutions or whether they are cared for at home by their mothers.

The problem we get into is that we almost pat ourselves on the back as middle-class parents about how much it costs to raise a child. We say, look, we put out this much money to raise a child.

On the other hand, if we do it publicly and put it under the guise of day care or child care, we think the cost is outrageous.

Somehow, we have got to get our philosophies together.

It seems to me if we talk about social services for all children as day care, day care is going to be equated with something way too expensive and never pass.

On the other hand, if we tell the public that we are providing not only day care for those children who need it, but social services, health care, medical care, and so on, for all children, we are ultimately saving the taxpayers dollars.

Though it may look expensive now, we are taking care of children, and I think we ought to look at this bill as a child care bill, not as something that just helps mothers.

It has always seemed to me that most children have two parents, one male and one female. And that the whole burden of the care of the child should not be just on the female. This is looked at as a women's bill. This is a children's bill.

Mr. BELL. Thank you. Ms. Fraser. I want to commend you also for your very cogent remarks.

It is a great pleasure to have the wife of Congressman Fraser before the committee.

Ms. FRASER. And a mother of a number of children. I consider myself a day care worker.

Mr. BELL. I find your husband a most able legislator.

Ms. FRASER. Thank you.

Mr. BELL. Ms. Hill.

Ms. HILL. As a representative of Federally Employed Women, Inc., known more generally by its acronym, FEW, I want to express our concern for the need for clear authorization for child care for Federal employees.

Current surveys by unions, women's programs, and Federal agencies indicate available child care arrangements are not easily accessible or affordable.

Inadequate child care results in either time away from the office or distraction at work. Also to be considered are the large number of highly skilled women whose services are not available to the Government because of inadequate or unavailable child care. These factors should make child care a matter of major concern to the Federal Government as an employer.

OMB contends "it would be inequitable to consider child care as a fringe benefit" and "taxpayers should not be asked to subsidize such general special benefits for a few privileged Federal employees."

However, other benefits are provided in Federal facilities which are not wholly equitable. These include, for example, parking facilities and credit unions located in or on Federal space. Federal credit unions pay for operating costs to maintain space and services in Federal facilities, but do not pay any rent per se. Parking is, in effect, a subsidy to selected employees. Access to free or below commercial rate parking is openly inequitable in its availability. Special facilities are also granted to handicapped workers and top level administrators to meet their special needs.

Moreover, we now accept the concept of employer-employee partnerships for retirement, health benefits and similar programs. While employer involvement in child care as a fringe benefit may be a new idea, it appears to be a similarly reasonable one.

Federal participation in child care will cost money. However, it is not necessary to assume that if the Government takes a step forward, it will immediately undertake full subsidization, or that it may sponsor only blue ribbon programs.

It has not done so in the case of either retirement or health benefits. Both are costly programs and both are related to exigencies which most, but not all, people face in a lifetime. The need for child care services is in a similar category.

While it is most desirable that OMB relax its position toward federally sponsored child care programs in order to serve Federal employee needs, it is also important that the Federal Government consider its role as a model employer for business and industry. This is especially so since it encourages private industry to develop supportive programs to meet equal opportunity and child development goals.

With private industry beginning to move ahead in the area of day care as an employee benefit, it would be unfortunate if the Federal Government, in its employer role, were to bring up the rear rather than to participate with industry in this new venture.

The availability of training is another area in which the Federal Government discriminates against the parent with child care responsibilities.

Several training sites for mid-level training, for example, do not provide child care or do not permit child care on their facilities. One working mother, who was selected for training at Airlie House near Warrenton, Va., offered to bring a babysitter and pay for rooming arrangements for the children and the babysitter. She was told she could not do so.

FEW believes that many other highly skilled women and men are kept in positions below their skills and abilities due to inadequate or unavailable child care.

Many persons working for the Federal Government are responsible for the sole support of one or more children. In the Washington, D.C., area, for example, there are one-third of a million single parents. Most of these single parents are employed by the Federal Government.

Most parents paying child support default within 1 year. A recent Wisconsin study found there was full compliance in only 38 percent of the cases after 1 year; partial compliance in 20 percent,

and no compliance in 42 percent. Only 19 percent of nonpaying parents had any legal action taken against them.

FEW has no reason to assume Federal employee's experience in pursuing defaulting spouses with regard to child support will differ from their Wisconsin sisters.

Most parents cannot pursue any legal method of obtaining funds from a defaulting spouse due to the high costs of legal fees. For example, a full-time female Federal employee who was earning over $18,000 a year was told by a lawyer her case would not be accepted unless a lien was placed against her house or the total legal fees prepaid. This is not an uncommon practice.

Imagine the fate of other federally employed women—nearly three-quarters of whom occupy position in "general schedule" grade 1 through 6, with a top salary of $10,000.

FEW recommends Congress pass legislation authorizing and appropriating funds which would be available for child care for both Federal and private sector employees.

Mr. BELL. Thank you, Ms. Hill. Your prepared statement will be included in the record at the conclusion of testimony by this panel.

What programs are currently available for Federal employees?

Ms. HILL. I would like to introduce Julie Kisielewski. She is a colleague of mine. I would like to have her answer that question.

Ms. KISIELEWSKI. There have been programs in most major agencies. These were demonstration projects but most of them have folded because Government support was withdrawn when demonstration money was withdrawn.

Currently HEW, HUD and a few other major agencies still have projects; but they are very shaky. The cost is prohibitive to most parents, and many parents are forced to drop out as the fees are raised.

Mr. BELL. Do you know what the costs are?

Ms. KISIELEWSKI. The cost for most child care for Federal employees is $30 a week, and it may go up to as high as $50 per child.

Mr. BELL. What services are available in these programs?

Ms. KISIELEWSKI. It is more than custodial care in those cases. However, there is a high number of children per teacher, and the facilities are not always adequate. It is really a makeshift program in most agencies.

Mr. BELL. I have about three other questions I would like to ask you, Ms. Hill.

Is the income tax deduction enough of a subsidy for child care?

Ms. HILL. No. It is the only business related deduction for which there is income limitation and maximum deduction.

For instance, the income limitation for full deduction is $18,000, and over $18,000 it is reduced by $1 for every $2 of income.

What this means is that this limitation is really unreasonable or impractical for senior level employees. For example, Julie paid $8,500 last year for child care, but was only able to get a tax deduction for $1,900.

Mr. BELL. Will the passage of Public Law 93-647, which allows garnishment of Federal employees' salary for nonpayment of child support, relieve single parents?

Ms. HILL. I would like to refer again to the Wisconsin study which shows that 62 percent of parents are not complying after 1 year,

and only 19 percent had legal action taken against them. FEW has no reason to believe nonpaying Federal parents would be pursued in the courts any more frequently.

Moreover, I really do not think the Federal Government would intervene right away even if legal action were brought against delinquent parents so this would mean that there could be several months of delay.

Then, too, there would be a lengthy processing time to issue the first check, so the family will have suffered with nonpayment of the child support payments for several months, perhaps as long as a year or over.

Mr. BELL. What special problems in the area of child care do Federal employees have?

Ms. HILL. For example, there is really no clear authorization for Federal support of child care programs on federally owned or federally leased space.

Also, Federal employees have special problems in their early or late starting times. Most day care centers operate on the hours of 7 to 6, which are basically conventional working hours. Many Federal employees must arrive at their job at 7 o'clock in the morning. Therefore, they have this gap. What do they do with the child for the half hour or more that it takes them to get to their job?

At night, the problem is many Federal employees get off at 5:30, and in any large metropolitan area it is nearly impossible to get to the child care center within a half hour.

Another problem is that most people think of child care in terms of children, age 2 to 5. There is a problem of infant care. Then there is also the problem which the Office of Child Development has pointed out is a most severe or critical problem that is: after school child care.

Another child care problem area for Federal employees is training. The problem of training, which we have already mentioned, is that many of the sites for training are out of the city where the Federal employee works, and there is no available child care in this situation.

Mr. BELL. Ms. Kisielewski, you said you paid $8,500 for child care services, but you were only able to deduct $1,900.

Would you explain these figures?

Ms. KISIELEWSKI. There is a $400 monthly limitation on the amount you can deduct. If your income is between $18,000 and $27,000, you lose $1 for every $2 that you are over $18,000.

Mr. BELL. Ms. Plaskett, you say on page 2 of your statement that such programs should be open to all children regardless of the financial standing of parents.

Do you feel that with the strictures on the budget that these programs should be open to all parents?

You agree with Ms. Burris?

Ms. PLASKETT. Absolutely.

Our public schools are open to all children, and I feel that early childhood development must be open and available to all children.

I think that the statement that follows it clarifies one of the reasons I said that. Head Start operates in a ghetto and it is keeping poor children together and giving them very limited kinds of educational opportunities.

I would much rather see children of all economic backgrounds in the same classroom getting the same benefits that an early childhood education offers.

This is not to say that the National Organization for Women supports the prime sponsors delegated to the public school system, but rather that there be a variety of local options.

Mr. BELL. Thank you, Ms. Plaskett, and thank you very much, panel. It is a pleasure to have you before the committee.

At this time I wish to note that Congressman Jim Jeffords from Vermont has joined us.

Mr. JEFFORDS. It is good to be here.

Mr. BELL. I ask unanimous consent that the testimony of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., be inserted at this point in the record when it arrives. Unfortunately, this organization was unable to, due to other commitments have a representative appear on this panel, but they did request the opportunity to submit testimony to us for inclusion in the record.

[The prepared statement of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., Ms. Fraser, and the Federally Employed Women, Inc., follows:]

STATEMENT OF

THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF BUSINESS AND

PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUBS, INC.

ON THE

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES ACT OF 1975

April 1975

The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., is pleased to add its support to the growing number of individuals and organizations which are urging prompt passage of child and family services legislation.

Our organization, composed of 170,000 working women in all of the 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, officially recognized the need for child care services in 1970, when this subject was added as an item on our National Legislative Platform.

It is precisely because all of our members are working women, many of them with young children, that we are well aware of the problems caused by the lack of adequate day care facilities.

The need for child care has never been greater, but this need has been largely ignored, in part because of the erroneous belief that child care would benefit only a small number of individuals. Nothing could be further from the truth.

One out of every three mothers with children under the age of six is now employed. There are six million preschool children of working mothers, but only about one million licensed day care spaces available.

The number of mothers entering the job market is increasing, rather than decreasing. And most of these mothers, like other women, work for compelling financial reasons. Often they are the sole support of their families. Many times the working mother's paycheck makes the difference between living at a subsistence level and living decently.

Consider, too, the plight of the mother on welfare who is willing and able to work but who, if she is lucky enough to find adequate care for her children, is

unable to pay for it and still feed and clothe herself and her family. She has no choice but to stay home and accept welfare checks. The result is a loss to her dignity and a strain on family relationships.

Men, too, would benefit greatly from the availability of child care services. A young widower with children faces not only the loss of his wife and the mother of his children, but also the financial and emotional burdens of being both father and mother.

Increasingly, fathers are seeking and gaining custody of their children in divorce proceedings. They also have the problem of caring for their families while holding down full-time jobs.

In addition to the problems encountered by these men, the rising cost of living places enormous pressures on working fathers whose families are intact. Their wives might be quite willing to help out financially through part-time or full-time jobs if they could be assured that their children were being cared for properly at a cost which would make this employment meaningful.

But above all, let us not forget the children. Opponents of child care legislation contend that children should be cared for by the family, that day care will destroy the family. But what about those children -- and there are many of them -- who have only one parent, and that parent must work to provide support?

What is the effect of family tension on a child whose mother and father work because they must, but who worry because their child is not receiving adequate care?

What about the thousands of "latch key" children? Or the children who spend their days before television sets because their parents cannot afford -- or find -- proper care?

What kinds of strains are placed on a child whose mother needs and wants to work in order to maintain her sense of dignity, but who cannot because of the cost or unavailability of child care? Should these children and their families be deprived of adequate child and family services which they can afford? We think not.

Thus, we are glad to see once again efforts being made by Congress to develop and pass child and family services legislation. We sincerely hope that action in the 94th Congress will be swift. We note with regret that those preschool children who could have been helped by earlier proposed legislation are now in school, and more children - and parents - who need these services have taken their places.

While we will not attempt to discuss in any detail the pending Child and Family Services Act of 1975, we would like to make some comments on the legislation generally.

We are particularly pleased to see emphasized in both S. 626 and H. R. 2966 the beliefs that "the family is the primary and the most fundamental influence on children" and that "child and family service programs must build upon and strengthen the role of the family." We are concerned about the pressures of today's world on the family, and feel strongly that families need and welcome such support.

We highly approve of those provisions which call for strong parental involvement in the planning and operation of programs and services. While we in no way want to downgrade the value and importance of professional advice and participation in this area, we do believe that parents want - and need - to be as closely involved as possible with those services which will directly affect the lives and development of their own children.

The fact that the legislation calls for a wide range of quality services and programs is also of particular importance, in our opinion. The differences in community needs and resources, and the various needs and desires of families within those communities, require such a variety of programs and options. We believe families should have a choice.

Great stress should be placed on the quality of services. This quality should be high, whether the services are available free of charge to those who cannot pay, or on a sliding scale basis to those families which can make some financial contribution.

Finally, we would like to address the concerns of those who contend that federally supported child and family services will mean federal control and "brainwashing" of children. This is simply not the case.

As we mentioned before, the pending legislation makes clear that parents will be closely involved in determining the policies and practices of child care programs to ensure that their own children's best interests are being met.

We must emphasize that participation in any of the child and family service programs envisioned by S. 626 and H. R. 2966 is strictly voluntary. No one is required to use these services. No parents will be forced to enroll their children in any program or activity.

For those who want and need such services, however, it is important that they be available. We were particularly distressed by the "Families Don't Want Federal Day Care" buttons we have seen in the audience at hearings. Maybe some families don't. But should they deprive those who do? It has been amply docu-

mented through extensive testimony over recent years that many, many families not only want but desperately need child and family services.

We believe that the time is long past for our government to make a significant contribution toward filling this need. Passage of child and family services legislation should be a "must" item on the agenda for Congress in 1975.

Such legislation must be adequately funded, and consideration should be given to using first-year funds not only for planning, training, and technical assistance, but also to support those existing programs which meet the standards and are in financial difficulties.

We thank you for this opportunity to present our comments on the Child and Family Services Act of 1975. We urge that Congress give it immediate attention, keeping in mind these words of Urie Bronfenbrenner:

"The worth of a nation may be measured by the concern of one generation for the next."

# # # # # # # # #

TESTIMONY OF ARVONNE S. FRASER, LEGISLATIVE CHAIRPERSON AND FORMER PRESIDENT, WOMEN'S EQUITY ACTION LEAGUE (WEAL), before the joint hearing of the Senate Subcommittees on Children and Youth, and on Employment, Poverty and Migratory Labor and the House Select Subcommittee on Education, Wednesday, March 12, 1975, on the Child and Family Services bills, S.626 and H.R. 2966.

Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the opportunity to testify before the committee in support of this excellent Child and Family Services bill. The need for expanded day care facilities is well documented and well known. Our organization, WEAL, is pleased to join with the other women's organizations here this morning testifying in favor of good day care for children. (WEAL's main concern is with education as well as the legal and economic rights of women.

As background, I would like to refer to the book Children and Decent People, edited by Alvin L. Schorr. The last selection in the book, by Schorr himself, is a chapter entitled "Poor Care for Poor Children -- What Way Out?" He describes the current situation:

> "Organized programs for children turn out, when examined, to be programs for the poor, for blacks, and for the otherwise disadvantaged...
>
> "Most day care is custodial in nature, despite all the talk about quality...
>
> "The marginally poor, if they use day care, pay for it in proprietary centers. Children of the middle classes use none of these systems. Almost all use some form of care, but they rely on unpaid or paid help in or near the home...
>
> "...a system that is limited to poor children can deal with some unspecified portion of the need without greatly troubling the nation. That may be its function. If the welfare of all of our children or of the children of influential parents were at stake, provision would respond more sensitively to need."

Schorr's thesis is that we all have a responsibility to the children of this nation and the more universal the system we devise, the better the service to children.

I want to say that I am no stranger to day care. I've done it at home for nothing for years -- and I look on it as work. Half of our children -- my husband's and mine -- attended some form of public day care part time. The first two were in a cooperative nursery school in what was called a settlement house in Minneapolis, Minnesota in the 1950's. Our last child integrated a church basement day care center in Southwest Washington for two years before she went to kindergarten. Society thinks that middle-class children get day care free -- from their mothers who work for love, not money. The only problem is that not every family can finance that kind of day care. Also, fewer women are willing to contribute that kind of day care to society because society will not give it any significant reward.

WEAL believes that day care is a children's problem and not solely a woman's problem. Therefore, we are concerned with the other elements in this bill as well as simple day care.

The first five years of children's lives are most critical. During this time their brains gain 90% of their weight and they learn a sense of self-respect, self-motivation, and how to relate to others. Studies have shown that how well children do in school depends largely on their early environment. With 5.9 million children under the age of 6 having mothers working outside the home, society can no longer neglect this critical period in child development. We can no longer disregard the need for government action in this area.

We must be concerned about nutrition. Children who are inadequately fed cannot learn effectively. WEAL is pleased that this bill, like the Head Start program and the school lunch program, does contain provisions to insure that children attending day care centers would be fed adequately.

We are pleased also that the bill provides for regular medical testing and preventive health care. We must spot early signs of learning disabilities, physical handicaps, emotional problems and all other difficulties that often become apparent only when a child is watched, supervised, and checked. Poor coordination, hyperactivity, speech defects, listlessness, slowness to learn or react -- all these are relative aspects of behavior that become only apparent under careful observation. Day care personnel must be trained to watch for any handicaps or defects and must know when to call in other trained help and whom to call.

The bill also provides for dental care for children. This is important since many young children never receive dental care at all. Their families may neglect dental care because of lack of time or because of the belief that "baby teeth" will fall out anyway and are therefore unimportant. This misconception causes many problems for children later, affecting their dental health, their eating habits and their looks.

Other provisions of the bill, ranging from education to social services, are important. And we are pleased that family day care is included in this bill. The intimacy of family day care in many situations is preferable, especially for infants. And we do not think that this is profit-making day care. It is performance of a vital social service.

The needs I have outlined are not confined to pre-schoolers. Unfortunately, our schools seem to think all children have mothers at home. No one worries about kids after school, during school vacations or summer holidays. Some children need places to go before school if their parents go to work early. Some need places for recreation or study after school or during vacations. Sometimes weekend supervision is needed.

More and more parents are working outside the home. More neighborhoods are left without many adults around and therefore no baby sitting. We need more facilities, and a variety of facilities for child care. We don't want big institutions that are mere dumping grounds or parking lots for kids. We want facilities with strong health, social service, recreational and educational programs over which parents can have some kind of control. And we don't want children priced out of good care.

Child care is usually viewed as a "women's issue" and, indeed, it is a central factor in the liberation of any working mother -- whether she works inside or outside the home. However, we testify for this bill not only because we are looking for liberation but also because we care about children -- all children.

Let us prove Professor Schorr wrong in the future. Let's not judge the care we give children by the financial circumstances of their parents. Let's give all kids the kind of care they need and the kind of care we would want for every child. And let's do it soon.

Thank you.

57-649 O - 76 - pt. 3 - 5

FEDERALLY EMPLOYED WOMEN, INC.
An Organization for Opportunity and Equality for Women in Government
NATIONAL PRESS BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20004

Founded in 1968

Testimony Prepared by Federally Employed Women, Inc. for Senate Subcommittee on Youth and Children and House of Representatives Select Committee on Education, March 11, 1975

As a representative of Federally Employed Women, Inc., known more generally by its acronym, FEW, I am going to express the need for more and better child care for employees in the Federal sector.

Current surveys by unions, women's programs and federal agencies indicate available child care arrangements are not easily accessible or affordable. Inadequate child care results in either time away from the office or distraction at work. Also to be considered are the large numbers of highly skilled women whose services are not available to the government because of inadequate or unavailable child care. These factors should make child care a matter of major concern to the federal government as an employer.

The Civil Service Commission, in Federal Personnel Management Bulletin No. 713-22, suggests that equal opportunity plans show "sensitivity to accommodate to special needs of women employees and applicants, e.g., day care centers, part-time employment." This policy is similar to official federal guidelines affecting private sector employees. In Chapter 41, Code of Federal Regulations, 60-2.25 (h), Revised Order No. 4, the federal contractor is guided "to encourage child care . . . appropriately designed to improve employment opportunities for minorities and women." While there are some indirect things federal managers can do to cooperate with employees and employee organizations regarding day care, OMB's position effectively bars them from providing line item budgetary support to child care programs. The current federal policy also means that employee organizations and unions with an interest in child care services cannot enter into any meaningful discussion with management in regard to child care as an employee benefit. In other words the Executive Branch cannot follow through on what it encourages in the private sector. Who can wonder when a private employer asks 'Does the federal government really mean what it says?'

OMB contends "it would be inequitable to consider child care as a fring benefit" and "taxpayers should not be asked to subsidize such generous special benefits for a few privileged Federal employees." However, other benefits are provided in federal facilities which are not wholly equitable. These include, for example, parking facilities and credit unions located in or on federal space. Federal credit unions pay for operating costs to maintain space and services in federal facilities, but do not pay rent per se. Parking is, in effect, a subsidy to selected employees. Access to free or below commercial rate parking is openly inequitable in its availability. Special facilities are also granted to handicapped workers and top level administrators to meet their special needs.

Moreover we now accept the concept of employer-employee partnerships for retirement, health benefits and similar programs. While employer involvement in child care as a fringe beneift may be a new idea, it appears to be a similarly reasonable one.

Federal participation in child care will cost money. However, it is not necessary to assume that if the government takes a step forward, it will immediately undertake full subsidization, or that it may sponsor only blue ribbon programs. It has not done so in the case of either retirement or health benefits. Both are costly programs and both are related to exigencies which most, but not all, people face in a lifetime. The need for child care services is in a similar category.

While it is most desirable that OMB relax its position toward federally sponsored child care programs in order to serve federal employee needs, it is also important that the federal government consider its role as a model employer for business and industry. This is especially so since it encourages private industry to develop supportive programs to meet equal opportunity and child development goals. With private industry beginning to move ahead in the area of day care as an employee benefit, it would be unfortunate if the federal government, in its employer role, were to bring up the rear rather than to participate with industry in this new venture.

The availability of training is another area in which the federal government discriminates against the parent with child care responsibilities. Several training sites for mid-level training, for example, do not provide child care OR do not permit child care on their facilities. One working

mother, who was selected for training at Airlie House near Warrenton, Virginia, offered to bring a babysitter and pay for rooming arrangements for the children and the babysitter. She was told she could not do so! FEW believes many other highly skilled women and men are kept in positions below their skills and abilities due to inadequate or unavailable child care.

Many persons working for the federal government are burdened by the sole support of one or more children. Most parents paying child support default within one year. A recent Wisconsin study found there was full compliance in only 38 per cent of the cases after one year; partial compliance in 20 per cent and no compliance in 42 per cent. Only 19 per cent of non-paying parents had any legal action taken against them. FEW has no reason to addume federal employee's experience in pursuing defaulting spouses with regard to child support will differ from their Wisconsin sisters.

Until January 1 of this year it was impossible to attach a government employee's salary for any reason. With the passage of Public Law 93-647, government or military wages or social security beneifts can be attached for child support. Thus before January 1, persons married to federal employees who defaulted on child support payments had no legal recourse.

Most parents cannot pursue any legal method of obtaining funds from a defaulting spouse due to the high costs of legal fees. For example, a full-time female federal employee who was earning over $18,000 a year was told by a lawyer her case would not be accepted unless a lien was placed against her house or the total legal fees prepaid. This is not an uncommon practice. Imagine the fate of other federally employed women--nearly three quarters of whom occupy positions in "general schedule" grades 1-6.

Moreover most states require that child support payments be totally unprovided for several months before the courts will intervene. Thus if child support checks come sporadically or if checks in nominal amounts such as $10.00 are cashed by the parent with the children; good intent is deemed present on the part of the defaulting parent.

If the concept of child care as a valid area of employer involvemnt were accepted, there are a variety of options open for program implementation. If granted authority to use salary

and expense funds and discretion as to their use, a federal manager could work with employees and employee organizations to survey needs and to develop programs that best meet the needs in a particular agency and geographic area. If an agency decides, with its employees, that there is a need to establish a child care program, the program can be designed to meet actual needs, giving consideration to budgetary constraints and to parents' ability to pay.

In places where several federal agencies are located near each other, interagency cooperation may be established to locate space, provide seed money and partially support a continuing program for pre-school children. There might be some after-school and vacation programs established to meet needs of parents with school-aged children. Rather than centers serving only federal employees' children, there might be cooperation with community centers through purchase of service or employer consortium arrangements. Another option is the voucher system which permits parental choice of arrangements best meeting individual requirements. A further concept, tried by the Illinois Bell Company, is a referral service to day care services in the employee's neighborhood where the employer recruits and pays to train residents who provide care in their homes.

To be realistic, fear of excessive costs is probably the major hindrance to development of child care programs as an employee benefit. Arguments about inequity, other priorities, or who should have the responsibility are probably secondary. Currently, cost seems to be evaluated almost exclusively from the standpoint of dollar outflow, rather than as an investment which offers the possibility of greater employee contribution to the employer and less drain on the social and economic systems elsewhere. We need to know more about costs to the society when injury, illness, and family dependency result because parents have inadequate access to acceptable child care arrangements. Under current arrangements, a price is probably being paid in terms of energy of working parents and social damage to children and families which we know little about. Faced with the increasing reality of mothers in the work force, we can not hide behind the assumption that total responsibility for child care rests with the parent. Society has a self-interest in adequate child cares services, just as it has an acceptable self-interest in education. It is necessary that OMB, in cooperation with federal executives in their employer role, re-examine the position on this issue. Costs must be evaluated, not just in terms of dollars, but form the standpoint of a human investment with a concomitant return.

FEW recommends Congress pass legislation authorizing and appropriating funds which would be available for child care for both federal and private sector employees.

# # # # #

Mr. BELL. I now ask the research panel to come before us: Dr. Susan Gray, Peabody College, Nashville, Tenn.; Dr. James Gallagher, director, Porter Graham Child Development Center, University of North Carolina; and Ms. Earline Kendall, Nashville, Tenn.

Dr. Gallagher, I want to recognize you as an old friend of the Congress. You have testified many times before us, and we have always admired your work on aid to the handicapped. You always seem to be in the forefront fighting to help children in need.

I also want to recognize Dr. Susan Gray and Ms. Erline Kendall for the excellent work you have done.

Dr. Gray, you are listed first. Please summarize your statement, in the interest of time.

STATEMENT OF DR. SUSAN W. GRAY, PEABODY COLLEGE, NASHVILLE, TENN., ACCOMPANIED BY DR. JAMES J. GALLAGHER, DIRECTOR, PORTER GRAHAM CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA, AND MS. ERLINE KENDALL, NASHVILLE, TENN., A PANEL

Dr. GRAY. I will do the best I can.

I am a child psychologist from Peabody College in Nashville, Tenn. I was pleased to be asked to testify, because the provisions of this bill lie very close both to my heart, and also to my experience of over 15 years in working with children and parents from low-income homes.

For over the past decade my research and study have been directed toward improving the education and social development of young children and their parents, especially those from low-income homes.

Chilren are our future. Yet for low-income parents, the future promises to be only a recapitulation of the past. I think that is the biggest thing that poor people have to bear, seeing the same things happen to their children that happened to them.

I see this bill as offering promise in interrupting this vicious cycle.

Now, I would like to make just three points about this bill.

So far, most of our witnesses have testified concerning the need for group day care. It is a tremendous need. I do not deny it. I would like to talk about some other aspects of it.

First, I would like to talk about the importance of home-based programs for parents who either cannot or do not wish to work outside the home. There are many of these.

As our other witnesses have testified so eloquently, group day care is both a very scarce commodity and a highly expensive commodity. To keep two children in adequate day care by the estimates Ms. Hertzberg made, which are, I think, quite reasonable ones, costs $2,300 per child.

Let us assume two children, with the mother earning minimum wage; day care is costing somebody more than the mother earns. So I think perhaps it is appropriate to think of meaningful alternatives for group day care where it is either not possible, and that seems to be in a very high percentage of cases, or not desired.

We have worked at the Peabody for over a decade in home-based programs for parents with general emphasis on trying to help the parents become more effective as teachers of their children, and as you might say, programers of the environment for the children, what they select, what they help the children get attention to.

These programs have had positive results, and I would say fairly modest, but all such programs do.

I think they offer promise as meaningful alternatives for day care when this alternative is appropriate.

The next point I would like to make relates to the need for support systems for parents.

Two of our people testified on this, and one mentioned a group type support system; an illustration from another field of course would be Alcoholics Anonymous, which has been amazingly effective.

Parents profit by this kind of support, but I think there are other ones that are very important for low-income people. Everybody needs it. Low-income people are extremely vulnerable. They live on a knife edge, between catastrophe and surviving as a family unit. And support systems, such things as emergency child care, either in the home or in other places, emergency loans, homemaker services, any number of things which exist over the country, but exist in very small supply.

In my city of Nashville, if a family is in such dire straits that it has no food in the house, there is a charitable organization that will give them $10 to buy food. That is fine for today. But where is the food coming from tomorrow?

So I think all sorts of support systems are important, and many that are not thought of as support systems, but are support to parents who are trying to set an education and environment to the child. I mean by this the cultural and recreational and educational facilities of the city, which low-income people do not use typically. They do not have library cards. They do not go to public parks. A number of things that I think would be truly helpful.

My third and last point is to talk about day care, but the form of day care that only one person has mentioned, and then in a very negative manner. This is family day care.

I sympathize with her experiences in trying to find adequate day care for her infant. It is very hard to find. Family day care, as many people realize, by no means all, is about three or four times as frequent as group day care.

In other words, 60 to 80 percent of children in day care are in family day care homes, where a mother, in her own home, cares for six or seven children.

Family day care does not have to be bad. It is not always bad. It can be good.

We have had experiences with Peabody, where we are trying to improve the quality of family day care; it is very much like trying to help the mother be more effective as a teacher and programmer in the children's environment. It has been successful.

I would like to recommend that when we think of the tremendous need for care for children, that at least it be made possible in the bill to provide funding that will bring it about that family day care can become a more adequate and effective service for children.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BELL. Thank you, Dr. Gray.

We have all known for years of your great service. I want to commend you for that, and for an excellent statement.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Gray follows:]

Written Testimony of Susan W. Gray on the Child and Family Services Bill

March 12, 1975

I am pleased to have the opportunity to testify on the Child and Family Services Bill, since several of its provisions lie close to my heart and to my work over the years. I am a child psychologist from Peabody College in Nashville, Tennessee. Since 1961 I have been concerned with planning special programs for children and parents from low-income homes. These programs have attempted to help young children to become more competent in meeting school and life demands, and in enabling their parents to learn how to provide the educational and social stimulation needed for the development of such competencies. It was such early work, by me and others, which provided part of the emphasis and the general direction of the Head Start program initiated four years later.

Children are our future. But for many of the eleven million American families who live in poverty their future promises to be merely a repetition of their past. One of the bitterest things poor parents must bear is seeing the same things happen to their children that happened to them, the same debilitating and often debasing circumstances of living. Yet it is possible to provide help for such parents, to enable them to be more effective in rearing their children and in providing better life situations for them. Helping with their children will not solve many of the problems of the poor, but it does make an attack on what is one of the problems of greatest concern to low-income parents, and to society at large--what will happen to the children?

I see the Child and Family Services Act as showing promise as a way of interrupting this wretched cycle. In the current economic planning of the Executive Branch we see at full length--in the words of Harry M. Caudill--the tendency our society has to capitalize its gains and socialize its losses. The problems of recession and the enduring energy crisis will hit most heavily on the poor. The provisions of the bill under consideration can offer to some degree a countervailing force to the callous way in which economic urgencies completely override humanitarian needs.

Furthermore, it is not only among low-income parents that the need for help is felt. All parents upon occasion feel this need and wish for some guidance when they face the difficult yet daily decisions that child rearing brings. I should like to give here a statement from one of the parents with whom we have worked, a mother whose husband has a very modest pay check, but enough to bring him above the poverty level.

> Every mother tries to teach her children the essentials of good manners, but there's a huge standstill when it comes to teaching the things they'll need to know for school.

> I'd tried teaching Joey (her two-year-old) the different colors and shapes but I had no idea where to go from there. I wasn't really sure I was accomplishing anything at all with him. He's still confused about colors sometimes, but shapes are down pat . . . .
>
> The thing that has impressed me most is the attitude of learning while playing. I've enjoyed the home visits as much as Joey and I'm going to feel a lot more confident with my baby when he's old enough for the games Joey plays now.

I should like to address myself to three aspects of the proposed funding provisions since they are the ones which relate most closely to my own experiences and knowledge.

First is the general emphasis on services for the family as a way of reaching children. I should like to stress here the listing of in-home services and education for parents and those others who serve as parents--grandmothers, older sisters, and so on. Our experiences for over a decade, as well as those of the limited number of other workers in the field who have done carefully designed and evaluated studies, suggest the worth of such programs to help parents become more effective in providing the experiences that promote the educational and social development of their young children. Such programs are economical as compared to adequate day care, costing only a fifth to a fourth as much. To be sure, they may have somewhat less impact on a single child who may be in an all day program (although this is not necessarily true), but the impact is made not only upon the child but upon the other children in the family and the parents as well. Probably most importantly the parent comes to see herself--or himself--as the child's first and most enduring teacher, and the home as the child's first school. Such services provide a meaningful alternative for day care where the mother either does not wish to, or cannot, work outside the home. Although important as an approach even in a more prosperous state of economy, this procedure would seem especially appropriate in our current economic situation. Last month the unemployment rate stood at 8.2, remaining steady since the last month. As you recall, however, this only happened because the loss of jobs was offset by the half million persons, mostly women and teenagers, who gave up on seeking employment. Presumably a large percentage of these were young married women with growing families. To the extent that their concern was with bettering their family status, a home-based program might be gladly received by them.

Furthermore, such services are attractive from the standpoint of the general availability of day care for working mothers. Such availability often makes the difference between whether a woman will decide to seek work or not. Current data (or rather the data from 1973) showed six million women with children under six who were employed. Yet there were available in licensed day care slots only

one million places, and 40 percent of these were allotted for children with special handicaps and children from low-income homes. Important as it is to increase the quantity--and quality--of day care, it is also important to provide alternatives for parents. There is currently a groundswell of interest in home-based programs as witnessed in the recent report of the Education Commission of the States. Encouragement for home-based programs would deserve a relatively heavy weighting in possible funding patterns for families.

My second point relates to the need for increasing support systems for families. Recently, careful analyses of the effectiveness of early education programs for children, or for children and parents together, suggest that only under certain conditions do programs have a lasting effect. One of these is that parents have help in sustaining the gains that may have been made with their children. This is especially true among the poor. Low-income people are vulnerable; they live on a knife edge between catastrophe and survival as a family unit. The poor lack the insurance, both literally and figuratively, which can enable them to cope with such happenings as the illness of the mother, a child who must go to the hospital, a husband who loses his job. Such services as emergency day care or home care for children, emergency loans, homemaker services, the ready availability of knowledgeable consultants on family problems--many things of this sort would contribute to giving the beleaguered family some support in its times of crisis. To be sure, these ideas are neither new nor earthshaking. Most of them exist, but usually only to a minimal degree. For example, in my own city, one charitable organization will provide $10 for a family in dire straits, one which is literally out of food. But where will food for the day after tomorrow come from? There are homemaker services in my community, but they are few and far between. If parents are to continue as their children's teachers and the programmers of the home setting for their children, they need support for the recurring emergencies that make up the life of the poor. Unless parents have some physical and emotional energy left over from coping with the frequent crises, they cannot be planful in continuing to serve as educational change agents for their children.

One might add here that it would be highly advantageous to provide some input for parents to allow them to take as full advantage of the educational, cultural and recreational resources of their communities as they relate to children. Nowadays, at least in our experiences, low-income parents for the most part are fairly knowledgeable about the availability of help from social agencies, although they are often not well versed, as indeed who is, in treading their way through the intricacies of the regulations and eligibility standards of such agencies. Our parents, however, tend to be ignorant of the public library, although we have an exceptionally good system in Nashville; they make little use of public parks and their recreational programs. The list could be greatly extended. These things too provide important support systems for parents in carrying out their function as teachers and providers of an educative environment for their children.

My third and last point speaks to day care provisions under this bill. I should like to emphasize an aspect of day care which is generally neglected in discussions of the field and certainly in the attention of the public; it often figures little in recommendation of increasing day care availability. This is family day care, that which a mother in her own home cares for a limited number of young children, typically no more than six or seven. Despite its neglect, the current data suggest that the overwhelming majority of children not cared for in their own home by relatives, baby-sitters, and the like are cared for in family day care settings. In Tennessee, under 9 percent of the children under six with working mothers are in licensed day care, group or family. Nationally, the figure is about 10 percent. Yet the national figures in 1972 show that 625,000 children are in group day care and approximately 2,000,000 in family day care--three children in family settings for only one in group settings.

A major way of expanding the quantity of day care slots, and also in improving the quality of the day care the majority of children receive would be to invest heavily in family day care. At present it tends to be a marginal occupation, poorly paid and supervised. The quality on the whole may be poorer than that of group day care taken as a totality, but the figures are hard to come by. At Peabody we have made a systematic study of improving the quality of family day care by working directly with the family day care mother to help her improve the quality of the educational and social stimulation she provides for the children in her care. It is feasible and not costly; unfortunately it is not free. It does not, however, require the heavy capital investment which constructing day care centers requires. This makes it an attractive option in expanding the number of day care slots available for children who need them.

Family day care is favored by many parents, because children are in small groups. Often care is provided in the child's own community. This not only is easier from the standpoint of transportation, but the mother knows the family day care worker personally, which helps build trust. Children are in small groups, and the atmosphere is more homelike. A sizeable investment in improving the quality of this service would yield large returns.

There are many other provisions of the bill which I see as offering hope in promoting family life and the development of competence in young children and in their parents, as guides of their children. These three, however, are ones that relate to my own areas of interest and competency; others have and will testify on the remaining aspects of the bill.

Mr. BELL. In the interest of time I think we will go directly to Dr. Gallagher, and then Ms. Kendall before we ask any questions.

Dr. Gallagher.

Dr. GALLAGHER. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate your kind remarks.

I would like to commend this committee for continuing in the face of the budget problems to go forward on this program, because I can hardly think of anything that is more important——

Mr. BELL. I would like to interrupt just a moment to say that Congressman Pressler from South Dakota has joined us.

It is a pleasure to have you with us.

Mr. PRESSLER. Thank you.

Dr. GALLAGHER. I think you have had some very eloquent statements of needs presented here. You do not need any more of that.

What I would like to focus on would be those elements of the bill that could bring quality programs to children and the families, and make a couple of suggestions, if I might, about the bill.

I am very pleased, first of all, to see that we have profited from our earlier experiences in trying to improve education or health services for children.

A rapid expansion of day care services would not likely be a great boon to families unless it would be accompanied by strong support services for personnel training, research, evaluation, and major demonstration and technical assistance efforts. It is these support services that can bring quality service to a local program.

The importance of support services is such that I would prefer that money allocated for them would be calculated on the basis of a percentage of the service allotments rather than be authorized as a separate figure.

There is a natural tendency in the appropriations process to cut such support efforts rather than reduce the local service programs where the need seems most urgent.

However, understandable such a move, the weakening of support services seriously weakens the direct service program itself. I would estimate a figure of about 25 percent of the service figure needs to be appropriated to the support services of training, research, and technical assistance in the initiation of the programs, perhaps being reduced to 15 percent as the program matures.

One reason to emphasize support services is that we are forever asking ourselves questions that sound profound, but which turn out to be irrelevant.

For example, we ask, "Is day care harmful to the child? Is day care helpful to families?" The answer to both is, of course, "Yes, sometimes, under certain circumstances." The same answer can be given if you ask whether a child will benefit or be harmed by staying at home with a parent or parent surrogate: "Yes, sometimes, under certain circumstances."

These are not the important questions. The impotrant questions are, "What are the circumstances in group care situations, or in home situations, that will be most beneficial to the child's development and to the integrity of the family?"

Although we know some of the answers, as professionals in the human services area, we need to learn a great deal more in order to

be confident that our counsel to parents and policymakers is adequate. This is why we need systematic research and careful evaluation.

I would like to make special note of one of our major program emphases at the Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. We currently operate three major technical assistance programs: TADS, the Technical Assistance Development System; DD/TAS: the Developmental Disabilities Technical Assistance System; and MELRS; the Mideast Learning Resource System.

The purpose of these technical assistance systems is to provide the latest knowledge on such issues as program planning, curriculum, evaluation, and communication to three very different sets of clients: a set of national demonstration centers for preschool handicapped children; the 50 State developmental disabilities councils; and the State departments of education in an eight-State region.

While the nature of the technical assistance varies according to the client, several principles apply to all of them and should apply to any systematic assistance programs for child and family service projects.

1. The assistance is based on the perceived needs of the client.

2. A contract is established between the client and the technical assistance program that clearly states the kind of help to be delivered, by when and by whom. Such a contract provides documented accountability.

3. A talent bank of consultants, each with their own area of specialty, is available on call to aid the local program's special needs. This means that lawyers, psychologists, pediatricians, et cetera, will help when problems arise requiring their expertise.

We are convinced that it is possible to organize technical assistance programs to provide continuing, systematic aid on complex programs to clients who have a felt need, but not sufficient expertise.

The development of many new child and family care programs by personnel who lack training and experience in management techniques, in planning, or in communications makes technical assistance essential. The staff of many of the new day care programs want and need this organized assistance, for it permits them to maximize the operation of their programs. Because of the importance of this assistance, State and regional planners should not assume that it exists, but should deliberately insert it as part of their total planning.

Because of my continuing concern for programs for handicapped children, I would like to focus on ways that these children and their families can become a part of, and not apart from, the rest of society.

We all know that those of us fortunate enough not to have handicapped children feel somewhat embarrassed or awkward faced with such parents and their children. We all too often try to avoid awkwardness by standing apart from these families. That helps them not at all; and diminishes ourselves as members of the human community.

I am delighted to see that section 103 provides the opportunity for handicapped children to participate with normal children in day care and family service programs. Our experience of mixing normal and handicapped children in programs, where parents and teachers have been properly prepared for it, has been good.

We should provide special training opportunities to prepare service staff for effective acceptance and progress of handicapped children into these normal programs.

As a former Federal bureaucrat I feel that I should comment on some of the administrative difficulties that will have to be faced if this bill passes in its present form. The desire to bring those citizens who are most deeply involved in delivery of family services into decisionmaking positions is admirable but not without a potential cost—that of administrative problems of impressive proportions. Let me mention a few of these:

1. The Office of Child and Family Services headed by a Presidential appointee, will have to determine how to allocate available funds. If the accumulated requests from a State exceed the allocation, the office must decide among State, county, and local plans—I see someone shaking their head, so maybe I did not read the bill correctly.

Unless protected, the political pressures on the office will be strong, particularly since the bill explicitly offers court action as an appeal mechanism. The office can expect to be embroiled in many disputes unless mechanisms can be worked out to insure fair and evenhanded decisions in fund allocations.

2. The procedure for the prime sponsors to develop a plan, submit it, and get it approved, will be inevitably long and involved. Let me sketch out some major steps.

A. The initial development of the plan with the adequate inclusion of the various necessary components and assurances will inevitably take much time and effort—2 to 3 months.

B. The Governor's office will then have to comment on the plan. If negative comments, or suggestions for change, are made then more time must elapse for the prime sponsor's Child and Family Services Committee to react—2 months at least.

C. The plan then must be reviewed at the HEW Office of Child and Family Services. This agency must hold it to balance against all other requests from the State. We can expect that this office will be chronically understaffed and that the turnaround time in reacting to plans is longer than expected—2 months at least.

Without much imagination one can conceive of other procedural breakdowns in the planning system and can envision a prime sponsor continually writing or amending plans rather than delivering needed services to children and families.

I would strongly recommend the acceptance of a 3-year plan with only annual updates required. This would cut the review process by two-thirds, and the submitting could be more effectively reviewed without the administering agency being buried under a mountain of papers.

3. Many of the prime sponsors and their clientele will have little or no experience with the collection of data on their program, it should anticipate major administrative problems before some workable management information system is developed.

In summary, I believe that this bill provides the potential for improving the development of children and maintaining the integrity of the family during the children's most crucial preschool years. By doing

so, the number of children with school and social problems should be reduced and more children will be able to express and enjoy their abilities, unhampered by developmental or psychological difficulties. As this occurs, all members of the family will be able to achieve a more effective and satisfying life.

I want to commend the committee again for the thoughtfulness that has gone into this bill, and I think it is extremely crucial to the child and family services around this country that it be passed.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BELL. Thank you very much, Dr. Gallagher.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Gallagher follows:]

TESTIMONY OF: JAMES J. GALLAGHER, DIRECTOR

FRANK PORTER GRAHAM CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES BILL H.R. 2966

MARCH 12, 1975

It gives me great pleasure to testify on behalf of the Child and Family Services Bill H.R. 2966 that is designed to meet such an important and crucial set of needs for young children and their families. Through research and practice we have discovered important knowledge about young children in the past two decades which relates directly to what this bill is designed to accomplish. Let me state a few of these discoveries:

1. The early years of life before the age of six appear to be most crucial to later development. The child from the earliest times in life is an active and responding person, strongly influenced by the world around him.
2. The child before five years of age forms a basic attitude to life and to new experiences and to social interactions that will influence, for good or ill, his or her relationships with the world for the rest of their lives.
3. If we wish to correct unfortunate experiences, the earlier that special assistance or help is provided

57-649 O - 76 - pt. 3 - 6

the more effective such help will be.

Few people will disagree on the importance of the family to the growing child but we can differ considerably on the kinds of measures that are useful in strengthening that beleagured structure. We clearly need many different options that allow for a maximum of diversity of services to fit a diverse society and its multiple subcultures. It is my reading of this bill that it deliberately provides such options.

Individual freedom of choice means little to the parent if there are no viable options to choose from.

A distinguished sociologist once studied the reaction of parents who had a handicapped child. Their natural reaction was to withdraw from social and church contacts in embarrassment and to sink within themselves. In short, they cut themselves off from the very sources of possible aid and assistance that could help them and their children.

In previous generations the "extended families" of aunts, cousins, grandparents, etc. offered needed support and provided a buffer to the family with small children. The modern family is extended only in a geographical sense, with relatives scattered across the country and often in little position to help each other. There is a good reason to doubt that many nuclear families comprised of a husband, a wife and two children are able to survive stress alone. Even less able to survive without assistance are the single parent or divorced parent families. As members of this American society, we must become a kind of "extended family" and assist parents and their children. I see this bill as one tangible way that we can all play this role.

I am particularly impressed by the evidence in this bill that

we have profited from earlier experiences in trying to improve education or health services for children. A rapid expansion of day care services would not likely be a great boon to families unless it would be accompanied by strong support services for personnel training, research, evaluation, and major demonstration and technical assistance efforts for it is these support services that can bring quality service to a local program.

The importance of support services is such that I would prefer that money allocated for them would be calculated on the basis of a percentage of the service allotments rather than be authorized as a separate figure. There is a natural tendency in the appropriations process to cut such support efforts rather than reduce the local service programs where the need seems most urgent. However, understandable such a move, the weakening of support services seriously weakens the direct service program itself. I would estimate a figure of about 25% of the service figure needs to be appropriated to support services of training, research and techical assistance in the initiation of the program perhaps being reduced to 15% as the program matures.

One reason to emphasize support services is that we are forever asking ourselves questions that sound profound, but which turn out to be irrelevant. For example, we ask, "Is day care harmful to the child?" "Is day care helpful to families?" The answer to both is, of course, "Yes, sometimes, under certain circumstances." The same answer can be given if you ask whether a child will benefit or be harmed by staying at home with a parent or parent surrogate: "Yes, sometimes, under certain circumstances."

These are not the important questions. The important questions

are, "What are the circumstances in group care situations, or in home situations, that will be most beneficial to the child's development and to the integrity of the family?" Although we know some of the answers, as professionals in the human service area we need to learn a great deal more in order to be confident that our consel to parents and policy makes it adequate. This is why we need systematic research and careful evaluation.

I would like to make special note of one of our major program emphases at the Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center at the University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill. We currently operate three major technical assistance programs: TADS, the Technical Assistance Development System; DD/TAS: the Developmental Disabilities Technical Assistance System; and MELRS: the Mideast Learning Resource System. The purpose of these technical assistance systems is to provide the latest knowledge on such issues as program planning, curriculum, evaluation and communication to three very different set of clients: a set of national demonstration centers for preschool handicapped children; the 50 state developmental disabilities councils; and the state departments of education in an eight state region.

While the nature of the technical assistance varies according to the client, several principles apply to all of them and should apply to any systematic assistance programs for child and family service projects.

1. The assistance is based on the perceived needs of the client.
2. A contract is established between the client and the technical assistance program that clearly states the kind of help to be delivered, by when and by whom.

Such a contract provides documental accountability.

3. A talent bank of consultants each with their own area of specialty is available on call to aid the local program's special needs. This means that lawyers, psychologists, pediatricians, etc., will help when problems arise requiring their expertise.

We are convinced that it is possible to organize technical assistance programs to provide continuing, systematic aid on complex programs to clients who have a felt need, but not sufficient expertise. The development of many new child and family care programs by personnel who lack training and experience in management techniques, in planning, or in communications makes technical assistance essential. The staff of many of the new care programs want and need this organized assistance, for it permits them to maximize the operation of their programs. Because of the importance of this assistance, state and regional planners should not assume that it exists, but should deliberately insert it as part of their total planning.

Because of my continuing concern for programs for handicapped children, I would like to focus on ways that these children and their families can become part of, and not apart from, the rest of society. We all know that those of us fortunate enough not to have handicapped children feel somewhat embarrassed or awkward faced with such parents and their children. We all too often try to avoid awkwardness by standing apart from these families. That helps them not at all; and diminishes ourselves as members of the human community.

I am delighted to see that Sec. 103 provides the opportunity for handicapped children to participate with normal children in day care and family services programs. Our experience of mixing normal

and handicapped children in programs where parents and teachers have been properly prepared for it has been good. The reactions of everyone involved have been enthusiastic. We should provide special training opportunities to prepare service staff for effective acceptance and progress of handicapped children into their programs.

As a former federal bureaucrat I feel that I should comment on some of the administrative difficulties that will have to be faced if this bill passes in its present form. The desire to bring those citizens who are most deeply involved in family services into decision making positions is admirable but not without a potential cost - that of administrative problems of impressive proportions. Let me mention a few of these:

1. The Office of Child and Family Services headed by a presidential appointee, will have to determine how to allocate available funds. If the accumulated requests from a state exceed the allocation, the Office must decide among state, county and local plans as to who gets money or how money would be prorated. Unless protected, the political pressures on the Office will be strong, particularly since the Bill explicitly offers court action as an appeal mechanism. The Office can expect to be embroiled in many disputes unless mecahnisms can be worked out to insure fair and even-handed decisions in fund allocations.
2. The procedure for the prime sponsors to develop a plan, submit it, and get it approved, will be inevitably long and involved. Let me sketch out some major steps.

A. The initial development of the plan with the adequate inclusion of the various necessary components and assurances will inevitably take much time and effort. (2-3 months)

B. The Governor's office will then have to comment on the plan. If negative comments or suggestions for change, are made then more time must elapse for the prime sponsor's Child and Family Services Committee to react. (2 months at least)

C. The plan then must be reviewed at the HEW Office of Child and Family Services. This agency must hold it to balance against all other requests from the state. We can expect that this Office will be chronically understaffed and that the turn around time in reacting to plans is longer than expected. (2 months at least)

Without much imagination one can conceive of other procedural breakdowns in the planning system and can envision a prime sponsor continually writing or amending plans rather than delivering needed services to children and families. I would strongly recommend the acceptance of a three-year plan with only annual updates required. This would cut the review process by two thirds and the submitting could be more effectively reviewed without the administrating agency being buried under a mountain of papers.

3. Many of the prime sponsors and their clientelle will have little or no experience with the collection of

data on the progress, it shoud anticipate major administrative problems before some workable management information system is developed.

In summary, I believe that this bill provides the potential for improving the development of children and maintaining the intregity of the family during the children's most crucial preschool years. By doing so, the number of children with school and social problems should be reduced and more children will be able to express and enjoy their abilities, unhampered by developmental or psychological difficulties. As this occurs, all members of the family will be able to achieve a more effective and satisfying life.

Mr. BELL. I would now like to turn to Ms. Kendall.

Ms. KENDALL. Thank you.

I will try to summarize.

I am Earline Kendall from Nashville, Tenn.

I am pleased to be here with these two researchers, but let me clarify, I am not from research. I am one of those people that Marianne Wright Edelman referred to a few weeks ago in her testimony, a mother who has sought child care, and I am a former director of several day care centers.

In the past 5 years I have opened three day care centers. The first of these was franchised day care, that is a dirty word to lots of people. Some of them have made testimony before this committee.

American Child Centers was to be a nationwide chain. I was reluctant to join that. I had much feeling that children and profit should not be combined. My first teaching experience was in Montgomery County, Md., and it was in a profit center. And it had left a bad taste in my mouth.

American Child Centers though began with good support from the business community and from the professional community. I was convinced that a quality program for children would be provided, so I became director of their model and training center.

Within 2 years that company folded, and its parent company folded, and it folded for a variety of reasons. One of those reasons was the high cost of good child care, even when middle-income families are willing to pay substantially for that care.

The parents who had been in that center liked what had happened to their children. Their children were happy. When that center closed, and the property was sold, those parents asked to form a nonprofit corporation to provide child care.

So a father who was a lawyer helped set up the nonprofit corporation. Another father who was in management helped us set up tax exempt status for that center.

Mothers who were professors of child development served on the board. Other parents helped find a facility. We found an abandoned school that the city leased to us for $1 a year, so the high cost of the beautiful building was not going to be part of our operation costs.

Within a very short time though that center too was in great financial difficulty, even though staff was now working for $2 an hour, whether or not they were director or cook, or teacher or aide.

So the high costs that had been part of the American Child Center franchise operation that we thought had caused its death were not because of financial difficulty in this nonprofit center. But this nonprofit center was also unable to function beyond just subsistence level.

So it is still operating, it is operating only by having benefit concerts, having garage sales, by having staff that continues to work for $80 a week. It is scarey to me to turn children over to people who can manage on $80 a week. That is not very much money.

I want people who are highly trained to be in charge of the children that I have anything to do with. Many of the people on this particular staff happen to have degrees, though. They happen to be highly skilled, and really dedicated. But the thought of seeing them continue on $80 a week is a frightening thing to me.

So when this center too was having difficulty, and could not carry my salary of $12,000, I was offered the directorship of a new title 4A center. We set this center up with some unique kinds of support. Half of the children in that center were under title 4A, which meant they were at the welfare level.

We did not want to see welfare families isolated. They are isolated already in their housing, and in many other ways. So 50 percent of the children in this center were on a sliding fee scale. Some of those families paid $5 a week, and some pay $25 a week.

They paid according to what they can afford. This center was supported not only with Federal funds of title 4A, but it had the backing of the church that gave us space, so again we had no expenses as far as space was concerned. We also had a church, another church, that was willing to be a third-party funder, and we had some private citizens that were wealthy and willing to support those families that could pay $5 a week or $10 a week when the cost was actually running around $30 a week for the individual child's care.

That center closed within 10 months. Lots of people told us that it could not be done, and they were right. We were unable to continue to include those ineligible for title IV–A funds.

One of the things I like about child and family services bill though, is that it looks like you are going to try to do what could not be done, and that is to provide for not only those people who are at the welfare level, but provide for those families who are above that level, and who are the working poor.

I am very concerned when I see families like a mother that I know—this is the third time that she and I have talked about care for her preschooler. She is a certified teacher. She has to work. Her second husband is a student. He has a part-time job. They are willing to pay, and they want good care for their son. But I do not have any place to tell her to go.

She and I talked last week, and I found myself withdrawing from the conversation. It was too painful for me and for her, too. I think about an infant who came to our center, whose mother is white and unmarried. She was a secretary at the time he was born. Her family was not willing to give her very much emotional or financial support during that period.

We really had to mother the mother.

She almost gave up her baby. She considered putting him up for adoption. She considered abandoning him without the adoptive process. But we referred her for counseling. We took him for shots. We bathed him, we fed him, we sent special formula home with him, because she was not willing to pay, or really able to pay for that, at that time.

And through the support services that she received, she and her baby were able to become a family. It looks to me like the bill that you are considering will be supportive of families.

I think that is important. I think of the little 4 year old who came to us through referral of a social worker. Her mother is mentally retarded. When the social worker found the mother was burning a mattress to keep the family warm, there was no water in the house, because there had been a real cold spell, and the pipes had broken, the

child was dirty, matted hair, and now she is not like that. She has bright, shiny eyes. She laughs a lot.

The program she was in has closed again. This is twice that the day care center this child was in was closed. She is a welfare recipient. But there is really not another place to put her. There are not enough slots for a child like this.

This child will be ready, or old enough to go to public first grade in September, but there is going to be a 6-month gap between the time that this center she was in closed and when she had been ready to go to first grade. If she is left loose for that 6 months, she is going to lose ground, and she does not have much ground to lose.

I am concerned about a mother who is a truck driver within our city, and she is desperate for day care for her 3-month-old son. For the last several weeks she has carried him in the cab of her truck. She says, "I cannot keep doing that." We need a place for her baby.

Those are some of the families that I know. Those are some of the reasons I have come to testify.

Some of the particular parts of this bill that I think are important are there. As I have worked in a franchised center and a nonprofit center, and in a title 4A center, some of the needs for day care that I am particularly concerned about are covered in this bill.

One of them is uniform code for facilities. We are meeting that in Tennessee, and we are meeting it in other States. The Child and Family Services Councils should make it possible to insure that families can have input in the program on what they really need for their child.

Medical service funding is an important aspect of your bill. And I am very pleased to see the variety of prime sponsors.

I am very much concerned that no one sponsor be given the whole package. Our public schools are certainly not fulfilling the needs of all our children, and I am pleased to see an allowance for variety of innovation and program staffing.

I am very much interested in this bill, and hope to see some of these provisions enacted.

Thank you.

Mr. BELL. Thank you, Ms. Kendall.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Kendall follows:]

TESTIMONY BEFORE THE SELECT SUBCOMMITTE ON EDUCATION
Presented by Earline Kendall
March 12, 1975

Honorable Chairman and members of the Select Subcommittee on Education, I am Earline Kendall from Nashville, Tennessee. I present testimony to you concerning the needs of children and their families as you consider the Child and Family Services Act of 1975. I present this as a professional who has opened three day care centers in the last five years. Two of these centers died within a year and the third continues a precarious existence at this time. I present this as very personal testimony from the perspective of a mother who works and had child care needs when my son was younger.

My first day care experience was as a newly graduated teacher in a day care school in Montgomery County, Maryland during the late 1950's. During that era day care had a bad name; most care was custodial. Even as a beginning teacher I could see the discrepancy between what I was taught in education classes and what was going on around me. After one year of teaching in the day care school I began teaching public kindergarten which I continued for three years until pregnancy caused me to retire. Recognizing the many societal and personal pressures that I felt I planned to stay home with my son until he was "much older". My own experience in day care had shown me how inadequate some programs were. In addition I had accepted the middle class culture's value of the mother caring for her own child in the home. This lasted a total of two years. By this time financial pressures overcame other pressures and I again taught in the public schools, now first grade. During these years in the public schools I taught mostly children from middle income families but even some of these were "latch-key children" who let themselves into their own homes after school with the key worn on a string around the neck.

After being teacher-director of a campus laboratory kindergarten four years the opportunity came to direct the training center for the proposed nationwide chain of franchized day care called

American Child Centers, Inc. I hesitated about accepting this position, in part because I was reluctant to mix children and profit. The quality of the program planned by early education specialists whom I respected, along with the excitement of being part of a national effort to provide care for young children persuaded me to try this venture.

My own need for good preschool child care was just over. My dissatisfaction with care for my toddler in our home by a housekeeper, the problems when a relative and then a succession of neighbors kept him during the day and later after school made me very aware of the acute need for good child care among families in the middle income brackett.

American Child Centers, Inc. and its parent company went broke after less than two years for a variety of reasons. The company was top heavy with highly paid executives. Another reason for financial difficulty was the expense of a quality child care program. Even middle income families could not afford the entire cost of good care when there was more than one child in the family, and sometimes not then in single parent families, or families with other problems.

Parents and children had responded well to the program that American Child Centers provided. When the announcement was made that the center was to be closed and the property sold parents rallied. A father who was a lawyer helped draw up a charter for a non-profit corporation. Another father who was a professor of management set into motion the procedures for securing tax exempt status. Two mothers who were professors of child psychology served on the board. A father who helped raise money from foundations and other sources offered his help. Other parents combed the community for space for 100 three, four and five year olds, renovated the basement of an abandoned elementary school and helped staff move on Christmas week end. This non-profit, parent initiated center is Nashville Child Center and continues today a very precarious existence in that location with the help of garage sales, benefit concerts and gifts.

When this center also began to show signs of financial struggle in spite of no executive salaries, rent of only one dollar a year and a staff willing to work for eighty dollars a week (including

the cook, janitor, teachers and director) I accepted a position as director of Children's Center, Inc. which was opening with TitleIV-A funding for half the forty-five children in the center and a sliding fee scale of payment for the other half of the children. A church was the third party source of funding and another church gave us space for the center. Several wealthy citizens made pledges to the program to subsidize the portion of the budget that those on a sliding fee arrangement were not able to pay for themselves.

With this budget arrangement a Title IV-A child whose mother was on welfare and found a job was not terminated from the program. Her child could be carried by contributions from others and she could pay perhaps five dollars a week at first. Later, as she began to earn more she could assume more and more of the actual cost of the services which her child and family received. We had infants as young as six weeks (maternity leave is often limited to six weeks post partum) and children up to school age in the center. This enabled several families to have more than one child in the program. Last week I visited a Title IV-A program and recognized a four year old who had been in the Children's Center. I asked David where his little brother Daniel was and as told, "he's too little". This is an added burden on this mother as she tries to get to work, pick up the children after work and be involved in the center activities.

The provision in the Child and Family Services Act for the type of flexible services to families that we tried at the Children's Center makes me support this bill. The advantages for children and their families when poverty level families are not isolated in centers by themselves are many. The fear of the unknown that is caused by the isolation of low income families or middle income families from those of other economic levels can be minimized when the children become friends and the parents share experiences. A sliding fee scale is necessary to allow this type of interaction.

The Children's Center was battered but able to weather the fight with Secretary Weinberger over the change in regulations, but it could not weather increasing costs, as well as loss of individual and church support as the economy dipped. Its closing

ten months after it had opened was painful for the families served and for those who had dreamed of the possibilities offered these families. It later reopened with three of the teachers and eighteen of the children in one of the teacher's homes. Even that small home center was forced to close this month. They had eager parents with modest incomes and children from families on welfare. They received $15 a week from the Department of Public Welfare for each of these children. It was not enough.

Each of these day care centers appeared to have secure financial backing when it was planned and implemented. The franchized center had backing from the business and professional community. The non-profit center has strong parent involvement and staff commitment. The Title IV-A center had support from the federal government and a church community with the added help of wealthy, interested citizens. Each of these funding mechanisms was not enough. Each of these centers had financial difficulty within a year. Each was threatened with closure several times.

Each time a center closes where children are cared for in a warm, supportive environment both parents and children are uprooted. Parents are forced to try to find another place; children are forced to adjust to other caregivers, other peers, other routines. if their parents are able to locate another center. The low income parent and the parent who is able to pay part or all of the cost of care both find it exceedingly difficult to find any place that meets their own needs and those of their children. Last week I was questioned for the third time by a mother who is a certified teacher about placement of her preschool age son. Each time she has had to move him it has become more difficult to find a place that is comfortable for her and for her child. I had no hope to offer her and found myself withdrawing from the discussion. It was too painful for both of us. This mother has to work. Her second husband is a student with a part time job. She cares about what happens to her child. She is willing and able to pay for this care but is unable to find care that she accepts as good for her child.

I remember Roland who came to us as an infant. His mother is white, unmarried and a secretary. She wanted to keep her baby

but initially received little emotional or financial help from her own parents. Good day care programs "mother the mother" through periods of crises. We took Roland for shots, bathed him and sent special formula home with him. She was not able to pay extra for the soybean formula that he needed. After a few months her life stabilized. Until it did, the day care center was her family and support. Through counseling referral we gave her and the medical and food support she received, she and her baby were able to become a family.

Elora Jean was referred to us by a social worker who found her during a particularly cold period of January in a house without water (the pipes had frozen and burst). Her mentally retarded mother was burning a mattress to keep them warm. She was covered with soot. Her hair was matted and her eyes were dull. Some of the staff focused on her dirt and began to clean her up but one side focused on Elora Jean and began to take her to wash the car (and play in water at the same time). She began to work and play with the child. Today Elora Jean has an alert look in her eyes. She laughs out loud and speaks easily. She is still behind intellectually her own age peers. Next year she will be old enough for the public school. The day care center has twice closed on her. To leave her only at home with her mother who is retarded for the next six months is to put her further behind.

A mother who drives a truck within the city is desperate for day care for her three month old son. She has been taking him with her in the cab of her truck for the last few weeks and cannot continue doing that. Other infants are locked in cars while their mothers work.

Recently I was in the office of a day care director whose center has school age and preschool children. A mother called in tears because she could not find someone to look after her two school age daughters. She is in the midst of divorce and her emotional and financial resources are exceedingly limited right now.

The Child and Family Services Act appears to offer stability of funding for a variety of family needs. Low income families, particularly, have had many exciting programs offered and then withdrawn. Stability of funding and the coordination of services are especially needed after the on-again-off-again funding of the last few years. In 1969 there were 42 distinct programs for children

administered by 15 different federal agencies. This has enhanced the possibility that services will be fragmented and/or discontinued.

Some of the aspects of this bill that I am particularly pleased to see are the following:

A uniform code for facilities - presently health inspections are made by the municipal health inspector (who demands a three compartment sink in the kitchen, a seperate hand-washing sink for the cook with a foot control and assorted other local requirements), a state health inspector who operates from a county office who counts toilets, basins and sniffs for the odor of Clorox which hopefully indicates the use of the disinfectant. Fire and safety regulations vary enormously also. A uniform code for facilities could ensure safer environments for the children and perhaps the elimination of the expense of one thousand dollar kitchen sinks.

Child and Family Services Councils - Community control of services and fun s should ensure that community priorities are being met.

Medical services funding - will enable a child to receive h alth care that is crucial to his intellectual, emotiona and physical development. Nashville has two medical schools and a broader range of services because of these. By acquainting families with these services and often helping them get to the site where the services are offered we have been able to help some families get some services that are needed. Funding for medical assistance throughout the nation could raise the level of living for many children.

The variety of prime sponsors - will allow communities to determine the kinds of programs needed. No existing institution has a hold on the best possible mode of service to meet all needs of all families. Certainly many public schools have failed to meet the purposes for which they are set up. To add to a public school system all of the day care needs of families is to ask for chaos.

Commitment to variety and innovation in programming and staffing - provides for flexibility of services. Broad bases

57-649 O - 76 - pt. 3 - 7

of staff training and retraining are needed throughout existing day care and certainly for any wide program of new day care services. Family day home workers need a dependable salary; they need supervision, training and support. Many families prefer this type of child care but nearly all of the women who offer this care in their homes are totally isolated from others who offer similar services, from resources that could be helpful to themselves and the families they serve.

This testimony has caused me to reflect on many of the negative aspects of child care in this nation. It has caused me to review my efforts on behalf of my own child and many other children. I am not without hope. Starting June 1, I will be the Child Development Coordinator of two Title XX day care centers serving 45 children each and an after school enrichment program for school age children. This neighborhood program has been serving community needs for more than fifty years. It also had to close a day care center last year for lack of funds. Initially, only welfare children will be served in the center that is reopening and in the other center which has been operating a number of years in a housing project. My hope is that the state of Tennessee will include in its state plan for Title XX allowance for some families to be served on a sliding fee basis. I have indicated my belief in this provision to the Department of Public Welfare, which is responsible for producing our state plan.

As I examine Title XX, and as I recall living through Title IV-A funding, and compare them both to the Child and Family Services Act I am impressed, on a point by point comparison of these bills, that support for the family and its needs is paramount in the Child and Family Services Act. Titles XX and IV-A have too often focused on the need to remove adults who happen to be parents from a state of dependency. This is not enough for our children. The broader provisions in the Child and Family Services Act are needed by families in a range of incomes.

Mr. BELL. Ms. Kendall, I would like to ask you a couple of questions.

What services were available in your center?

Ms. KENDALL. In the title 4A center, we had a social worker, and she was able to help families find medical services, but we were not able to offer those.

In our city we have two medical schools. We have a variety of services that are available if families know about it. We had social services, we had educational services, and we had transportation services.

Mr. BELL. Do you feel they were adequate?

Ms. KENDALL. In that center I think they were certainly adequate. We had 45 children who were aged 6 weeks to 6 years. We took children that young because many mothers had maternity leave that lasted only 6 weeks.

Mr. BELL. Thank you.

Dr. Gallagher, I have a couple of questions for you.

I want to point out that I liked your innovative idea regarding a 3-year period, instead of every year. I think that is a very excellent idea.

Possibly the most important question that I can ask pertains to the program delivery system.

In your opinion, what specific role should the public schools have in any legislation we develop?

Dr. GALLAGHER. I think over the long run the public schools are going to become more and more involved in working with younger and younger children.

Well over half of the States in this country have provisions in their legislation for handling preschool youngsters who are handicapped. Some of those provisions begin at birth, and for the young deaf children, for example, before the age of 1.

The public schools are going to have the space available because of the declining student population that will happen over the next decade.

I would see that over the long run public schools will become more and more involved, but not as they are currently structured.

I would see a substantial change taking place in the primary grades, and earlier education of these youngsters, coming from greater recognition of the overall comprehensive needs of the child. The child has health needs, social needs, and the family needs to be more critically involved in these programs.

The schools, as they are now structured, would have a difficult time accepting this. But I think the schools can restructure themselves, and it would be of great benefit to everybody if they did in concert with the kind of provisions that are in this bill.

I would not want to get this bill entangled in a professional battle between who owns this territory. I would like to see options open in terms of diversity of possible agencies that would operate these programs, at least initially.

Mr. BELL. You do not believe, then, that the schools would want to make the decision as to whether they have the primary role?

Dr. GALLAGHER. I do not think at this stage of development. In the long term, the public schools are one of our strongest institutions—one of the points made by people is that the schools are overbureaucratized.

Yet we say that we need training, and the kinds of backup systems that the public school system has.

If you establish this major effort for child care, you are going to have to set up an alternative bureaucracy, a shadow bureaucracy in the child services area to do the same things that the school does.

I think that in the long run you are better off with the educational system, assuming one more responsibility.

Mr. BELL. Thank you.

Dr. Gray, there are already Federal child development programs, Head Start, and Social Security Child Care provisions, for example.

Should this new program incorporate them, or be in addition to them?

Dr. GRAY. I really have no answer to that. I hope it will not be instead of them.

Mr. BELL. Would anyone else like to comment?

Dr. Gray, given a limited budget, what provisions of the child development legislation would you stress? I have asked this question of previous witnesses.

Is there anything that comes to mind that you would particularly emphasize?

Dr. GRAY. I think no different from the points I made in my testimony, I would recommend that we do not lose sight of alternative ways of working with families.

Certainly there needs to be heavy allocation for day care. This is a true need. I think it would be most unfortunate to see all of the moneys drained into that, because we still face the fact that three-quarters of the mothers of children under six who work—I mean who have children under six do not work. And those in single parent homes, half of them work.

It might be desirable if more worked, and it might be desirable if fewer worked. I would hate to see funds allocated entirely for group day care particularly, which is very important, and also very expensive.

Mr. BELL. Thank you.

Dr. Gallagher.

Dr. GALLAGHER. I would like to reemphasize another point in my testimony. The diversity of programs that Dr. Gray mentioned is crucial.

I do not think any one pattern ought to be supported. What we have experienced in the past in that we cut back on our support services, when we are short of money. And that means that we have not gotten the personnel properly trained.

We have not received the kind of resources to back services programs when they need help, and call for crisis assistance. If we cut back the support system services, we are going to have poor quality programs.

We need a balanced program in terms of direct services through a diversity of program efforts, but with support services that back up the service programs so you are sure of a quality program.

There is no point to evaluate programs 4 years later if you have not provided the basis for the quality services in the first place.

Mr. BELL. Dr. Gallagher, would you say that professionals are necessary to operate these programs?

Dr. GALLAGHER. Yes; I think so. There is an effective marriage that can take place between parents and professionals. It is going to require a working out of roles and whose responsibility is what.

I think you can get parents to express themselves in terms of what policies are, what ought to be carried out, and what they want. The professionals then can decide how it is going to be done, and under what circumstances, to work with individual children who have individual needs.

Mr. BELL. Should we utilize paraprofessionals?

Dr. GALLAGHER. Yes; paraprofessionals are a very important part of this team, and should be included in it, if they are properly prepared. If the paraprofessional knows who to go to ask difficult questions when they get into difficulty.

The whole point is you can use less well trained personnel if there is always someone standing behind them whenever a difficult situation comes up that they need help on.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Pressler, do you have any questions?

Mr. PRESSLER. Yes. I would like to ask a question concerning how these funds get down to the people, or how the administration works, in particular regarding handicapped children.

If we earmark funds to serve handicapped children, can we assume that the provision which includes them will result in benefits to the handicapped, or does earmarking of funds in this area frequently result in very little administrative action?

Dr. GALLAGHER. That is a difficult question. I think that the provision for providing some of the funds for handicapped children has had a beneficial effect in the Headstart program.

I think it can have an extremely beneficial effect here.

I would like to see an organized technical assistance program established as part of this program, that would hire professional help and assistance to those centers that need it in order to effectively integrate the handicapped child into the program.

I think that if they have that background and support, they may find it surprisingly easy to integrate handicapped children into the program. The fears the people have about handicapped children participating in these programs are the fears of adults. They are not the fears of children.

When we find that the handicapped child has the same needs, the same kind of requirements as average children, and the same kind of personality as average children, then great benefits can come from everybody involved, not just the handicapped child, or family that has special crisis needs in terms of trying to get help for their children. The benefits extend to what the normal child learns, about what a handicap is, what a handicapped child is. The ixing of the parents of normal and handicapped children can be very beneficial, and a learning experience for both.

I think that those technical assistance systems, plus some kind of spot checks on individual programs to make sure that that 10-percent provision is being cared for, would be the first step I would take.

I do not think a nationwide monitoring system makes very much sense, but some kind of spot checks should be done regularly to make sure that these provisions are being taken care of.

Mr. BELL. Further questions?

Mr. PRESSLER. No further questions.

Mr. BELL. Dr. Gray, Dr. Gallagher and Ms. Kendall, it has been a real pleasure to have had you before the committee, and I want to commend you for your very excellent statements.

At this point I order printed all statements of those who could not attend and other pertinent material submitted for the record.

[The material referred to follows:]